On the Degrees of Freedom of SISO X-networks with Synergistic Alternating Channel State Information at transmitters

Ahmed Wagdy[⋆†], Amr El-Keyi[†], Tamer Khattab[⋆], Mohammed Nafie[†]

[⋆]Electrical Engineering, Qatar University, Doha, Qatar.
[†]Wireless Intelligent Networks Center (WINC), Nile University, Egypt.

May 24, 2016

arXiv:1605.07069v1 [cs.IT] 23 May 2016

Abstract

In this paper, we consider the two-user single-input single-output (SISO) X-channel and K-user SISO X-network in fast fading environment. It is assumed that the transmitters have access to synergistic alternating channel state information (CSI). Specifically, the CSIT alternates between three states, namely, perfect, delayed and no-CSIT, in a certain manner to enable these states to work together cooperatively. These states are associated with fractions of time denoted by λ_P, λ_D and λ_N, respectively. For the two-user X-channel, simple upper bound is developed to prove the tightness of the achievability result of 4/3 DoF under a certain distribution of the availability of three CSIT states for $\Lambda(\lambda_P = 1/3, \lambda_D = 1/3, \lambda_N = 1/3)$. For the K-user X-network, it is shown that the sum Degrees of freedom (DoF) is at least $2K/(K+1)$, using two-phase transmission schemes over finite symbols channel extension and under the same distribution of the availability of $\Lambda(\lambda_P = 1/3, \lambda_D = 1/3, \lambda_N = 1/3)$.This achievability result, can be considered as a tight lower bound, coincides with the best lower bound known for the same network but with partial output feedback in stead of alternating CSIT. Hence, we show that the role of synergistic alternating CSIT with distribution $\Lambda(1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$ is equivalent to the partial output feedback. Also, this lower bound is strictly better than the best lower bound known for the case of delayed CSI assumption for all values of K. All the proposed transmission schemes are based on two phases transmission strategy, namely, interference creation and interference resurrection, which exploit the synergy of instantaneous CSI and delay CSIT to retrospectively align interference in the subsequent channel uses. The proposed transmission schemes offer DoF gain compared to partial output feedback, delayed CSIT and no-CSIT. The achievable DoF results are the best known results for these channels.

1 Introduction

The scarcity of the wireless spectrum and the increasing growth of high data rate demands arise the impossibility of separating the concurrent transmission completely in frequency and impose that the transmissions necessarily occur at the same time in the same frequency band, separated only in space which introduce more signal interference in wireless networks. As a result, the received signal at each receiver is the desired transmitters signal of intended user in addition to the signals from many undesired or interfering transmitters of the other users. Consequently, it is widely known that signals interference is the main performance limiting factor of most wireless networks. Moreover, as the number of users in a wireless network sharing the same spectrum increases, the network becomes more and more interference limited. Therefore, establishing the performance limits of wireless networks turns out to be more challenging.

Interference alignment, the state-of-the-art in interference management [1], arises the possibility of establishing the performance limits of wireless networks in terms of characterizing the sum degrees of freedom (DoF) of many wireless networks. For example, in [2] it was shown that M×N X-network

can achieve $\frac{MN}{M+N-1}$ DoF, the DoF upper bound of that network, using simple interference alignment scheme over infinite symbols channel extension. The K-user SISO X-channel is the most comprehensive and fundamental setting for the information theoretic study of interference alignment in multi-user wireless networks. Interestingly, this setting, can be considered as a combination of broadcast and multi-access channels, is the general case where each transmitter has an independent message for each receiver, for a total of K^2 independent messages. Specifically, if all the transmitters are combined into one compound transmitter with K transmit antennas and the all the receivers are combined into one compound receiver with K receive antennas, then the resulting setting is point to point MIMO channel. While, if transmitters are combined into one compound transmitter and the receivers are remained distributed, then the resulting setting is MISO Broadcast channel. Also, the interference channel and Z-channel can be derived out from the X-channel by setting the appropriate messages to null. Moreover, the studying of the X-channel was contributed to showing the great of potential of the interference alignment in the early stages. In particular, the authors of [3]introduce an efficient signaling scheme, known as MMK scheme, which works at a corner point of the achievable region for the MIMO X-channel, specifically, it is shown that for a MIMO X channel with 3 antennas at each node, a degrees of freedom of 4 is achievable by a combination of dirty paper coding, successive decoding and zero forcing. While in [4] it is proved that simple zero forcing is sufficient to achieve the same achievability results of the MMK scheme in [3], the key idea for this interesting approach is interference alignment.

Considerable work in literature of interference alignment has focused on characterizing the degrees of freedom of X-channel and X-network. Contrary to what has been established in the context of memory-less point-to-point channel that the channel feedback does not increase the capacity [5], the channel feedback, known as CSIT, in multi-user networks can significantly widen the capacity region and hence the degrees of freedom region. Throughout literature, the CSIT plays a leading rule in charactrizing DoF of wireless networks, and was the canonical motif and the influential ingredient in developing the phenomenal interference alignment techniques. Under full CSIT assumption; where the transmitters have global and instantaneously perfect CSI, the wireless networks achieve the highest DoF and enjoy the widest DoF region. In [2], it is proved that the DoF of M×N-user SISO X-network with full CSIT is upper bounded by $\frac{MN}{M+N-1}$ also the authors proposed a partial interference alignment scheme that asymptotically approach the upper on DoF within an $\epsilon > 0$ by considering large channel extensions. In certain cases, when whether the number of transmitters or receivers are equal to two, the upper bound is achievable and perfect interference alignment is attained within finite channel extension. On the other hand, in the total lack of CSIT, the DoF region of most wireless networks collapse to narrowest region, where it's corner points are achievable simply by time or frequency division multiplexing between users [6, 7] however, in certain scenarios, the interference alignment is still feasible. Specifically, in [8], Syed Jafar paved the way to achieve interference alignment by exploiting only the knowledge of heterogeneous channel coherence structures associated with different users in the same network even in complete lack of knowledge of the channel at the transmitters, i.e. the X channel without no CSIT and under the heterogeneous block fading in both time and frequency assumption; one user suffers time selectivity and other is frequency-selective, achieves 4/3 DoF and hence coincide with the best known DoF upper bound on it.

Extensive research efforts have been devoted to discover middle ground between the two extremes; full CSIT and no CSIT, such as quantized CSIT [9,10], compound CSIT [11–13] and others that make use of temporal correlation yet the most remarkable one is what is widely known as delayed CSIT. This model was first introduced by Maddah Ali and David Tse in [14] for the Gaussian multiple-input single-output(MISO)broadcast channel (BC). The delayed model introduced a fundamental, and rather counter-intuitive observation that the completely outdated channel knowledge to the transmitters in i.i.d. Rayleigh fading model,where the channels take completely independent values every time slot, creates great opportunities for interference alignment and significantly improve the DoF of MISO BC.

In [15], Maleki et al. applied the delayed CSIT model to the distributed transmitters networks such as X channel and interference channel. They showed that the 2-user SISO X channel and 3-user SISO interference channel, under delayed CSIT assumption, can achieve 8/7 and 9/8 DoF, respectively. Then, in [16] and et al. introduced a new transmission strategy specially tailored to the distributed transmitters networks that efficiently exploited the delayed channel knowledge to provide new achievability results that outperforms what have been obtained in [15]. Particularly, they showed that 6/5 and 5/4 is achievable for the 2-user and 3-user X-channel, respectively. In this paper, We consider a two user Gaussian X channel where each node is equipped with single antenna. In this channel, transmitters T_1 and T_2 have four independent messages W_{11}, W_{12}, W_{21} and W_{22} for receivers R_1 and R_2 such that W_{ij} originates at transmitter j and is intended for receiver i. Earlier research work on the DoF of the two-user X channel have determined that the upper bound for DoF of two-user single-input single-output (SISO) X channel is 4/3 and for MIMO one is $4M/3$ where M is the number of antennas per node [**?**, **?**, 17]. These upper bounds are achievable with global, perfect and instantaneous CSIT and when the channel coefficients are time varying or frequency selective and drawn from continuous distribution. The authors of [15] showed that even in fast fading environment and for interference networks consisting of distributed transmitters and receivers, delayed CSIT channel could be beneficial and have a great impact on increasing DoF. They proved that for the two-user SISO X channel, the 8/7 DoF is achievable with delayed CSIT. New results have been demonstrated in [16] where the two user SISO X channel with delayed CSIT could achieve 6/5 DoF and for three user X network could achieve 5/4 DoF.

In this work, we consider the two-user SISO X channel with alternating CSIT. The main question we ask is whether the *synergistic alternation* in the availability of CSIT is beneficial in this channel as it is in collocated transmitters networks. We answer this question in an affirmative way by presenting Theorem 1 and discussing the synergistic benefits. Unlike what is commonly thought that the synergistic benefits of alternating CSIT could be more sensitive to or may be lost depending on whether the transmitter of the network are distributed or collocated, we end up with the synergistic alternation of CSIT is still very beneficial in distributed transmitters network. The second question we ask is any alteration pattern is synergistic alternation and has synergistic benefits that could provide extraordinary DoF gain. We negatively answer this question through remarks 1,2,3 and 4; where, we show that there exist some certain alteration patterns in which the different channel knowledge availability states could not work together in cooperative way but they work individually and the corresponding DoF dwindle to the sum of their individual DoF. Furthermore we find the synergistic alternation patterns and dissociative ones.

2 System Model

A K-user SISO X channel is considered. In this channel, there are K independent transmitters T_1,... T_K communicating with K independent receivers R_1,... R_K, where each node is equipped with a single antenna. Each transmitter has an independent message for each receiver. The received signal at the ith receiver at time slot t is given by

$$Y_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{K} h_{ij}(t)X_j(t) + N_i(t), \tag{1}$$

where $X_j(t)$ is the transmitted signal from T_j at the tth time slot which satisfies the power constraint $E\{|X_j(t)|^2\} \leq P_j$. The noise $N_i(t) \sim \mathcal{CN}(0,1)$ is the circularly symmetric complex additive white Gaussian noise with zero mean and unit variance generated at R_i at time slot t. In (1), $h_{ij}(t)$ is the channel coefficient from T_j to R_i and all channel coefficients are independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) over time and drawn from a continuous distribution.



Figure 1: K-user SISO X network

We assume that the receivers know all the channel coefficients instantaneously and with infinite precision thus global and perfect CSI is assumed at the receivers. In contrast, we consider three different states of the availability of CSIT; perfect (P), delayed (D), and no-CSIT (N). These states denote respectively the availability of CSIT instantaneously and without error, with some delay $\geq$ one time slot and without error, and the unavailability of CSIT at all. Let the state of CSIT availability of the channels to the ith receiver be denoted by S_i; where, $S_i \in \{P, D, N\}$, i.e., $S_2 = P$ indicates that each transmitter j, where $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\}$, has perfect and instantaneous knowledge of h_{2j}. In addition, let $S_{1\ldots K}$ denote the state of CSIT availability for the channels to the network;the first, second, ... K^{th} receiver, respectively. Therefore, $S_{1\ldots K} \in \{PP\cdots P, PP\cdots D, \ldots, NN\cdots N\}$. For example, $S_{123} = PDN$ refers to the case where T_j has perfect knowledge of h_{1j}, delayed knowledge of h_{2j}, and no information about h_{3j}. Moreover, we denote the CSIT availability of the channels to receiver i over n time slots of time channel extension by n-tuple $S_i^n = (S_i(1), \ldots, S_i(n))$. Similarly, the availability of CSIT for the channels to the network over n time slots channel extension, known by "CSIT pattern", is denoted by $S_{1\ldots K}^n = (S_{1\cdots K}(1), \ldots, S_{1\ldots K}(n))$.

The fraction of time associated with the state of CSIT availability for the network, denoted by λ_S where $S \in \{P, D, N\}$ is given by

$$\lambda_S = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n}\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{I}_S(S_i(t))}{nk}, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbb{I}$ denotes the Indicator function and k is the number of users, and hence,

$$\sum_{S=P,D,N} \lambda_S = 1. \tag{3}$$

Furthermore, we use $\Lambda(\lambda_P, \lambda_D, \lambda_N)$ to denote the distribution of the fraction of time for the different states $\{P, D, N\}$ of CSIT availability.

Let $r_{ij}(P) = \frac{\log_2(|W_{ij}|)}{n}$ denote the rate of W_{ij} for a given transmission power P where $|W_{ij}|$ denotes the size of the message set and n is the number of channel uses. The rate $r_{ij}(P)$ is achievable if there exists a coding scheme such that the probability of error in decoding W_{ij} goes to zero as n goes to infinity for all (i, j). The DoF region $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$ is defined as the set of all achievable tuples $(d_{11}, \ldots, d_{1K}, d_{21}, \ldots, d_{2K}, \ldots, d_{K1}, \ldots, d_{KK}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{K^2}$, where $d_{ij} = \lim_{P\to\infty} \frac{R_{ij}(P)}{\log_2(P)}$ is the DoF for message W_{ij}. The DoF of the network is defined as:

$$\mathrm{DoF}(\Lambda) = \max_{(d_{11},\ldots,d_{22})\in\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)} \sum_{j=1,i=1}^{K} d_{ij}. \tag{4}$$



Figure 2: Two-user SISO X channel

3 Two-user SISO X Channel

Motivated by the fact that multiuser networks with time varying channels, the variation in the availability of CSIT or the fluctuation in state of CSIT across different links is inevitable, we extend this verity modelled for MISO broadcast channel in [**?**] to the two-user SISO X channel. Form [**?**, **?**, 17], it is known that for the two-user SISO X channel the DoF of the network are bounded by 4/3. This upper bound is achievable over 3-symbol channel extension if the channel coefficients vary over time and each transmitter has global and *constantly* perfect CSIT over the 3 time slots.

In this section, we characterize the degree of freedom region of the two-user SISO x-channel, depicted in Fig. 2, with synergistic alternating CSIT, specifically,we present three illustrative examples for the proposed achievable scheme in three different patterns of CSIT availability as well as the converse proof. In all these cases, we show that 4/3 DoF is achievable by sending 4 different data symbols; 2 for each receiver over three time slots. The basic idea behind the proposed achievable scheme is to resurrect the interference formerly created, hence, interference creation-resurrection (ICR) strikes and interference alignment arises.

Inspired by the MAT scheme in [**?**], the proposed achievable scheme is performed in two phases over three time slots. The first phase is associated with the delayed CSIT state where the transmitters transmit their messages. As a result, the receivers get linear combinations of their desired messages in addition to interference. This phase is called "interference creation" phase. On the other hand, the second phase is associated with the perfect CSIT state and is called the "interference resurrection" phase. In this phase, the transmitters reconstruct the old interference by exploiting the delayed CSIT received in phase one and the perfect CSIT in the second phase. Hence, after three time slots, each receiver has two different linear combinations of its desired messages and only one interference term received twice. Noteworthy, in some cases the two phases can overlap over the 3 time slots.

3.1 Achievability Schemes

Let u_1 and u_2 be two independent symbols intended to R_1 transmitted from T_1 and T_2, respectively. Also, let v_1 and v_2 be two independent symbols intended to R_2 from T_1 and T_2, respectively. In the next subsections, we show that we can reliably transmit these symbols to their target destinations in 3 time slots in three different cases of alternating CSIT.

3.1.1 Scheme 1: Combined delayed and distributed perfect CSIT

As an illustrative example of this case, let us consider a 2-user SISO X channel with alternating CSIT pattern given by (DD, PN, NP) over three time slots. Here, we have combined delayed CSIT in the first time slot and distributed perfect CSIT over the last two time slots. Consequently, the proposed scheme is performed in two separate phases as follows.

Phase one: In this phase, the two transmitters greedily transmit all data symbols, i.e., $X_1(1) = u_1 + v_1$ and $X_2(1) = u_2 + v_2$. As a result, the received signals are given as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(1) &= h_{11}(1)u_1 + h_{12}(1)u_2 + h_{11}(1)v_1 + h_{12}(1)v_2 \\ &\equiv L_1^1(u_1, u_2) + I_1(v_1, v_2) \quad (5) \\ Y_2(1) &= h_{21}(1)u_1 + h_{22}(1)u_2 + h_{21}(1)v_1 + h_{22}(1)v_2 \\ &\equiv I_2(u_1, u_2) + L_2^1(v_1, v_2) \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

where $L_i^j(x_1, x_2)$ denotes the jth linear combination of the two messages x_1 and x_2 that are intended for receiver R_i and $I_i(z_1, z_2)$ denotes the interference term for receiver R_i which is a function of the messages z_1 and z_2 that are not intended for this receiver.

Phase two: This phase consists of two time slots where in each time slot the transmitted signals are designed such that the interference is resurrected at one receiver while the second receiver receives a new linear combination of its desired messages. Note that now the transmitters are aware of the CSIT of the previous time slot, i.e., T_1 knows $h_{11}(1)$ and $h_{21}(1)$ while T_2 knows $h_{12}(1)$ and $h_{22}(1)$. Also, at $t = 2$, the channels to the first receiver are known perfectly and instantaneously at the two transmitters, i.e., T_1 knows $h_{11}(2)$ and T_2 knows $h_{12}(2)$. As a result, the first time slot in this phase is dedicated to resurrecting the interference $I_1(v_1, v_2)$ received by R_1 in the first time slot. The transmitted signals of T_1 and T_2 are given by

$$X_1(2) = h_{11}^{-1}(2)h_{11}(1)v_1 \quad (7)$$

$$X_2(2) = h_{12}^{-1}(2)h_{12}(1)v_2 \quad (8)$$

and the received signals at R_1 and R_2 are given respectively by

$$Y_1(2) = h_{11}(1)v_1 + h_{12}(1)v_2 \equiv I_1(v_1, v_2) \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_2(2) &= h_{21}(2)h_{11}^{-1}(2)h_{11}(1)v_1 + h_{22}(2)h_{12}^{-1}(2)h_{12}(1)v_2 \\ &\equiv L_2^2(v_1, v_2) \quad (10) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, at the end of sub-phase one, R_1 has received $I_1(v_1, v_2)$, the interference received in the first time slot, and R_2 has received a new linear combination $L_2^2(v_1, v_2)$.

In the second sub-phase, the transmitted signals are designed to resurrect the interference received by R_2 in the first time slot and provide a new linear combination of the desired messages to R_1. The transmitted signals of T_1 and T_2 are given respectively by

$$X_1(3) = h_{21}^{-1}(3)h_{21}(1)u_1 \quad (11)$$

$$X_2(3) = h_{22}^{-1}(3)h_{22}(1)u_2 \quad (12)$$

where T_1 and T_2 utilize their perfect and instantaneous knowledge of their channels to R_2. The received signals at R_1 and R_2 are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(3) &= h_{11}(3)h_{21}^{-1}(3)h_{21}(1)u_1 + h_{12}(3)h_{22}^{-1}(3)h_{22}(1)u_2 \\ &\equiv L_1^2(u_1, u_2) \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

$$Y_2(3) = h_{21}(1)u_1 + h_{22}(1)u_2 \equiv I_2(u_1, u_2) \quad (14)$$

After the third time slot, the two receivers R_1 and R_2 have enough information to decode their intended messages. In particular, R_1 has access to two different equations in u_1 and u_2 only. The first one is obtained by subtracting $Y_1(2)$ from $Y_1(1)$ to cancel out the interference and the second equation is $Y_1(3)$ by itself as it is received without interference. Similarly, R_2 forms its first equation by subtracting $Y_2(3)$ from $Y_2(1)$ to cancel out the interference while the second equation is $Y_2(2)$.

Note that this scheme could be used also when the CSIT pattern given by (DD, NP, PN) but with minor modification in phase two, where sub-phase one is dedicated to resurrecting interference of R_2 instead of resurrecting interference of R_1 and sub-phase two is dedicated to resurrecting interference of R_1 instead of resurrecting the interference of R_2.

3.1.2 Scheme 2: Distributed delayed and combined perfect CSIT

Let us consider the 2-user SISO X channel with alternating CSIT given by (ND, DN, PP). Unlike case 1, here we have distributed delayed CSIT over the first two time slots and combined perfect CSIT in the last time slot. Consequently, the interference creation phase extends over two time slots while the interference resurrection phase can be executed in one time slot as follows.

Phase one: Each time slot of this phase is dedicated to one receiver where the two transmitters transmit the desired messages for this receiver. For example, if the first time slot is dedicated to R_1, then T_1 transmits u_1 and T_2 transmits u_2. The received signals at R_1 and R_2 are given respectively by

$$Y_1(1) = h_{11}(1)u_1 + h_{12}(1)u_2 \equiv L_1^1(u_1, u_2) \tag{15}$$
$$Y_2(1) = h_{21}(1)u_1 + h_{22}(1)u_2 \equiv I_2(u_1, u_2) \tag{16}$$

Therefore, R_1 receives linear combination $L_1^1(u_1, u_2)$ of its desired signals, while R_2 receives only interference $I_2(u_1, u_2)$. Similarly, in the next time slot, T_1 transmits v_1 and T_2 transmits v_2 and the received signals at R_1 and R_2 are given respectively by

$$Y_1(2) = h_{11}(2)v_1 + h_{12}(2)v_2 \equiv I_1(v_1, v_2) \tag{17}$$
$$Y_2(2) = h_{21}(2)v_1 + h_{22}(2)v_2 \equiv L_2^1(v_1, v_2) \tag{18}$$

where R_2 receives linear combination $L_2^1(v_1, v_2)$ of its desired signals, while R_1 receives only interference $I_1(v_1, v_2)$.

Phase two: This phase includes only one time slot where the transmitters resurrect the formerly received interference terms $I_1(v_1, v_2)$ and $I_2(u_1, u_2)$, while providing new linear combinations of the desired messages to the two receivers. In order to achieve this goal, the transmitted signals from T_1 and T_2 in the third time slot is given by

$$X_1(3) = h_{21}^{-1}(3)h_{21}(1)u_1 + h_{11}^{-1}(3)h_{11}(2)v_1 \tag{19}$$
$$X_2(3) = h_{22}^{-1}(3)h_{22}(1)u_2 + h_{12}^{-1}(3)h_{12}(2)v_2 \tag{20}$$

and the corresponding received signals at R_1 and R_2 are given respectively by

$$Y_1(3) = L_1^2(u_1, u_2) + I_1(v_1, v_2) \tag{21}$$
$$Y_2(3) = L_2^2(v_1, v_2) + I_2(u_1, u_2) \tag{22}$$

where

$$L_1^2(u_1, u_2) = h_{11}(3)h_{21}^{-1}(3)h_{21}(1)u_1 + h_{12}(3)h_{22}^{-1}(3)h_{22}(1)u_2 \tag{23}$$
$$L_2^2(v_1, v_2) = h_{21}(3)h_{11}^{-1}(3)h_{11}(2)v_1 + h_{22}(3)h_{12}^{-1}(3)h_{12}(2)v_2 \tag{24}$$

At the end of the third time slot, each receiver can decode its intended messages by solving two equations. For example, R_1 subtracts $Y_1(2)$ from $Y_1(3)$ to cancel out the interference and obtain the first equation in u_1 and u_2 while the second equation is $Y_1(1)$ by itself as it received without interference.

Noteworthy, this scheme could be used when the CSIT pattern is given by (DN, ND, PP) but with minor modification in phase one where the two sub-phases swap their dedications from R_1 to R_2 and vise versa.

3.1.3 Scheme 3: Distributed delayed and distributed perfect CSIT

As an illustrative example, let us consider a 2-user SISO X channel with CSIT pattern given by (DN, PD, NP). Unlike the above two examples, we have distributed delayed CSIT over the first two time

slots and distributed perfect CSIT over the last two consecutive time slots. Consequently, the proposed scheme is performed in two overlapping phases as follows.

Time slot 1: The first sub phase of phase one begins at $t = 1$, and is dedicated to transmitting the desired messages of R_2, i.e., T_1 transmits v_1 while T_2 transmits v_2. The received signals are this given by

$$Y_1(1) = h_{11}(1)v_1 + h_{12}(1)v_2 \equiv I_1(v_1, v_2) \tag{25}$$
$$Y_2(1) = h_{21}(1)v_1 + h_{22}(1)v_2 \equiv L_2^1(v_1, v_2) \tag{26}$$

Therefore, R_2 receives the first linear combination $L_2^1(v_1, v_2)$ of its desired signals, while R_1 receives only interference $I_1(v_1, v_2)$.

Time slot 2: At $t = 2$ the overlap occurs between the two phases. In particular, sub-phase two of phase one and sub-phase one of phase two begin simultaneously. In this time slot, sub-phase two of phase one creates interference at R_2 with while sub-phase one of phase two is designed to resurrect the interference term $I_1(v_1, v_2)$. The transmitted signals are given by:

$$X_1(2) = u_1 + h_{11}^{-1}(2)h_{11}(1)v_1 \tag{27}$$
$$X_2(2) = u_2 + h_{12}^{-1}(2)h_{12}(1)v_2 \tag{28}$$

and the corresponding received signals are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(2) &= h_{11}(2)u_1 + h_{12}(2)u_2 + h_{11}(1)v_1 + h_{12}(1)v_2 \\ &\equiv L_1^1(u_1, u_2) + I_1(v_1, v_2) \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$
$$\begin{aligned} Y_2(2) &= h_{21}(2)h_{11}^{-1}(2)h_{11}(1)v_1 + h_{22}(2)h_{12}^{-1}(2)h_{12}(1)v_2 \\ &+ h_{21}(2)u_1 + h_{22}(2)u_2 \\ &\equiv L_2^2(v_1, v_2) + I_2(u_1, u_2) \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Therefore, R_2 receives a new linear combination $L_2^2(v_1, v_2)$ of its desired signals and an interference term $I_2(u_1, u_2)$ as a by-product of the overlap, while R_1 receives the old interference $I_1(v_1, v_2)$ and the first linear combination $L_1(u_1, u_2)$ of its desired signals.

Time slot 3: In this time slot the transmitters send linear combination from u_1 and u_2 aiming to resurrect the interference terms $I_2(u_1, u_2)$ formerly received at $t = 2$, while providing a new linear combinations to R_1 of its desired messages. The transmitted signals are given by:

$$X_1(3) = h_{21}^{-1}(3)h_{21}(2)u_1 \tag{31}$$
$$X_2(3) = h_{22}^{-1}(3)h_{22}(2)u_2 \tag{32}$$

and the corresponding received signals are

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(3) &= h_{11}(3)h_{21}^{-1}(3)h_{21}(2)u_1 + h_{12}(3)h_{22}^{-1}(3)h_{22}(2)u_2 \\ &\equiv L_1^2(u_1, u_2) \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$
$$Y_2(3) = h_{21}(2)u_1 + h_{22}(2)u_2 \equiv I_2(u_1, u_2) \tag{34}$$

Finally, the two receivers R_1 and R_2 have enough information to decode their intended messages. In particular, R_1 has access to two different equations in u_1 and u_2 only. The first one is obtained by subtracting $Y_1(1)$ from $Y_1(2)$ to cancel out the interference and the second equation is $Y_1(3)$ by itself as it is received without interference. Similarly, R_2 its first equation is $Y_2(1)$ while forming its second equation by subtracting $Y_2(3)$ from $Y_2(2)$ to cancel out the interference.

Note that this scheme could be used when the CSIT pattern is given by (ND, DP, PN) but with minor modification in the two phases where the two sub-phases in each phase swap their dedications from R_1 to R_2 and vise versa .

3.2 Synergistic CSIT Alternation Patterns

In this section, we discuss CSIT alternation patterns that can provide synergistic gain in the DoF of the two-user SISO X channel within three-symbol channel extension. Since the possible CSIT states for the two users are given by $S_{12} \in$ {PP,PD,PN,DP,DD,DN,NP,ND,NN}, there are 9^3 possible alternation patterns over the three time slots.

First, we note that the aforementioned three examples in Section 3 present the CSIT patterns with the lowest CSIT sufficient to achieve 4/3 DoF. Definitely, any alternation pattern with channel knowledge higher than these patterns can achieve the same DoF, i.e., if we have S_{12} = ND, its higher CSIT state that could provide the same synergistic DoF gain are {NP, DD, DP, PD, PP}. Theorem 1 presents sufficient conditions on the lowest CSIT alternation pattern among three-symbol channel extension patterns for achieving the upper bound on the DoF of the two-user SISO X channel.

Theorem 1: For the two-user SISO X channel in time varying or frequency selective settings, the upper bound on the total DoF of the channel is achievable if the following requirements on the CSIT alternation pattern are satisfied.

1. Each transmitter has a delayed CSIT followed by a perfect CSIT over three time slots.
2. At each time slot, at least one transmitter should have some CSIT (perfect or delayed), i.e., the two transmitters should not be simultaneously without CSIT.
3. In the third time slot, at least one transmitter should have perfect CSIT.

Proof: We show that the three requirements of Theorem 1 limit the CSIT alternation patterns in a 3-symbol channel extension to the minimum CSIT synergistic patterns considered in the three examples of Section 3, and its higher CSIT patterns. Hence, the achievability of 4/3 DoF follows from the results of Section 3. The first requirement in Theorem 1 yields three possible minimum states for the CSIT of the channel to the ith receiver over three time slots $S_i^T \in$ {(D,P,N), (D,N,P), (N,D,P)}. As a result we have 9 possible combinations for the CSIT of the two-user channel. Six of these 9 combinations, satisfy the second and third requirements in Theorem 1 and are listed as the first 6 entries in Table 1. The remaining three combinations are those which have S_{12} = NN in any of the three time slots, i.e., (DD,PP,NN), (DD,NN,PP), and (NN,DD,PP). For the first combination, the minimum CSIT states that satisfy the three requirements are (DD,PP,PN), which is higher than (DD,NP,PN), and (DD,PP,NP), which is higher than (DD,PN,NP). From Table 1, we can achieve 4/3 DoF using achievable scheme 1 in both cases. Similarly, for the CSIT state (DD,NN,PP), the minimum CSIT that satisfy the requirements of Theorem 1 are (DD,ND,PP) and (DD,DN,PP) for which 4/3 DoF can be achieved using scheme 2. Finally, for the CSIT state (NN,DD,PP), the minimum CSIT that satisfy the requirements of Theorem 1 are (ND,DD,PP) and (DN,DD,PP) for which 4/3 DoF can be achieved using scheme 2 too.

CSIT state	Scheme	CSIT state	Scheme
(DD, PN, NP)	Scheme 1	(DN, PD, NP)	Scheme 3
(DD, NP, PN)	Scheme 1	(DN, ND, PP)	Scheme 2
(ND, DP, PN)	Scheme 3	(ND, DN, PP)	Scheme 2

Table 1: Achievable schemes for different CSIT states

3.3 The Degrees of Freedom Region

In this section, we characterize the degrees of freedom region $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$ and the sum degrees of freedom $DoF(\Lambda)$ for the SISO X channel with alternating CSIT for a certain region of distributions illustrated in Fig.1 where $\Lambda(\lambda_P \geq 1/3, \lambda_D \geq 2/3 - \lambda_P)$.

3.3.1 Outer bound

Theorem 2: $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda) \subset \mathcal{D}_{out}(\Lambda)$, where $\Lambda(\lambda_P \geq 1/3, \lambda_D \geq 2/3 - \lambda_P)$ and the outer bound on the degrees of freedom is defined as followed:

$$\mathcal{D}_{out}(\Lambda) \triangleq \Big\{ (d_{11}, d_{12}, d_{21}, d_{22}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^4 : \tag{35}$$
$$d_{11} + d_{12} + d_{21} \leq 1$$
$$d_{11} + d_{12} + d_{22} \leq 1$$
$$d_{11} + d_{21} + d_{22} \leq 1$$
$$d_{12} + d_{21} + d_{22} \leq 1 \Big\}.$$

Proof. We consider the SISO X channel with perfect CSIT as a special case of X channel with alternating CSIT where the CSIT availability distribution is $\Lambda = \big(\lambda_P = 1, \lambda_D = 0, \lambda_N = 0\big)$. Definitely, That case has the highest channel knowledge available to the transmitters that they need to align interference and deliver their messages perfectly to their intended receivers. While, additional channel knowledge cannot deteriorate the upper bound, it could make it quite loose, however in our case, we show in 3.3.2 that the upper bound is tight. Therefore, the upper bound on the degrees of freedom with perfect availability of CSIT, $\Lambda = \big(\lambda_P = 1, \lambda_D = 0, \lambda_N = 0\big)$, is strictly an outer bound for the degree of freedom of SISO X channel with alternating CSIT given any certain distribution of the availability CSIT. We can consider the SISO X channel as four different interlocking SISO Z channels; each one is formed by eliminating one message and setting the corresponding channel between any transmitter-receiver pair to zero i.e. Z_{12} is the conventional X channel but with $h_{12} = 0$. Calling the results in [**?**], in the context of Z channel,specifically, Lamma 1, stating that the maximum sum of degrees of freedom of a SISO Z channel over the degrees of freedom region of Z channel is an upper bound to the maximum sum of the degrees of freedom the X channel over the corresponding degrees of freedom region of X channel. In addition, Corollary 1, stating that the maximum sum of degrees of freedom of the X channel over the degrees of freedom region of corresponding SISO Z channel is upper bounded by one. Therefore, the maximum sum of any three degrees of freedom, corresponding to different Z channel, over the degrees of freedom region of SISO X channel is upper by one. Hence, The four conditions corresponding to the four different Z channels, represent outer bounds of the SISO X channel with perfect CSIT, and are straightforward outer bounds for the SISO X channel with alternating CSIT under any distribution $\in \Lambda(\lambda_P \geq 1/3, \lambda_D \geq 2/3 - \lambda_P)$. □

3.3.2 The Degrees of Freedom Region

Theorem 3: The degrees of freedom region of the two user SISO X channel with alternating CSIT under any distribution $\in \Lambda(\lambda_P \geq 1/3, \lambda_D \geq 2/3 - \lambda_P)$ is characterized as follows

$$\mathcal{D}(\Lambda(\lambda_P \geq 1/3, \lambda_D \geq 2/3 - \lambda_P) \triangleq \Big\{ (d_{11}, d_{12}, d_{21}, d_{22}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^4 : \quad (36)$$
$$d_{11} + d_{12} + d_{21} \leq 1$$
$$d_{11} + d_{12} + d_{22} \leq 1$$
$$d_{11} + d_{21} + d_{22} \leq 1$$
$$d_{12} + d_{21} + d_{22} \leq 1 \Big\}.$$

Proof. The converse proof of the outer bounds is directly implied here and therefore is omitted. The achievability arguments are proved as follows. Let $\mathcal{D}_\prime$ be the degrees of freedom region for the 2-user SISO X channel with alternating CSIT under any distribution $\in \Lambda(\lambda_P \geq 1/3, \lambda_D \geq 2/3 - \lambda_P)$. In order to fully characterize $\mathcal{D}_\prime$, we need to prove that $\mathcal{D}_\prime \equiv \mathcal{D}$. The points $K = (1,0,0,0)$, $L = (0,1,0,0)$, $M = (0,0,1,0)$, $N = (0,0,0,1)$ are the corner points of $\mathcal{D}$ and can be verified to belong to $\mathcal{D}_\prime$ through dedicating only one transmitter to send all the information symbols over all the time slots to only one receiver. While, $P = (1/3, 1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$ lies in $\mathcal{D}^{'}$ through the achievability schemes of *Theorem 1*. Now, consider any point $d^* = (d_{11}, d_{12}, d_{21}, d_{22}) \in \mathcal{D}$ as defined by *theorem 3*, we can easily verify that d^* belongs to the convex hull whose corner points; K, L, M, N, P and $O = (0,0,0,0)$. In other words, we can show that d^* is expressed as a convex combination of those points, K, L, M, N, P and O, of $\mathcal{D}^{'}$. For instance, $d^* = \alpha_1 K + \alpha_2 L + \alpha_3 M + \alpha_4 N + \alpha_5 O + \alpha_6 P$, where the coefficients α_i are non-negative for all $d^* \in \mathcal{D}$ and their sum is one. The coefficients α_i defined in Table 2, satisfy the two conditions of the convex combination and thereby all points in $\mathcal{D}$ are convex combinations of the achievable points K, L, M, N, P and O. Since the convex combinations are achievable by time sharing between the achievable schemes of the corner points,K, L, M, N, P and O, this implies that $\mathcal{D}^{'} \equiv \mathcal{D}$. □

	α_1	α_2	α_3	α_4	α_5	α_6
$\sum_{i,j} d_{ij} \leq 1$	d_{11}	d_{12}	d_{21}	d_{22}	0	$1 - \sum_{i,j} d_{ij}$
$\sum_{i,j} d_{ij} < 1$	$\frac{d_{11}-d_{12}-d_{21}-d_{22}+1}{3}$	$\frac{d_{12}-d_{11}-d_{21}-d_{22}+1}{3}$	$\frac{d_{21}-d_{11}-d_{12}-d_{22}+1}{3}$	$\frac{d_{22}-d_{11}-d_{12}-d_{21}+1}{3}$	$\sum_{i,j} d_{ij} - 1$	0

Table 2: Convex combination coefficients

3.3.3 Total sum of Degrees of Freedom

While the total sum of degrees of freedom (DoF) is defined as the maximum weighted sum of d_{ij} over all achievable degrees of freedom region $\mathcal{D}$, the outer bound on the sum degrees of freedom DoF_{out} is defined as the maximum weighted sum of d_{ij} over $\mathcal{D}_{out}$. The following theorem presents a tight outer bound $DoF_{out}(\Lambda)$ for the sum degrees of freedom DoF.

Theorem 4 : $DoF(\Lambda) \leq DoF_{out}(\Lambda) \triangleq \max_{\mathcal{D}_{out}}(d_{11}, d_{12}, d_{21}, d_{22}) = 4/3$, where $\Lambda(\lambda_P \geq 1/3, \lambda_D \geq 2/3 - \lambda_P)$

Proof. We formalize maximizing a weighted sum of d_{ij} over $\mathcal{D}_{out}(\Lambda)$ as a linear programming problem. We explicitly evaluate all the extreme points of the feasible space bounded by conditions in *Theorem 2*; $\mathcal{D}_{out}(\Lambda)$,typically for linear programming problem the solution is one of the vertices of the feasible set i.e. the vertices of the $\mathcal{D}_{out}(\Lambda)$, calculate the objective value -$DoF(\Lambda)$- at the extreme points(vertices), after eliminating the redundant bounds. The surprising finding is that the corresponding region of d_{ij}



Figure 3: Trade off between perfect and delayed CSIT

to the optimal $DoF = DoF_{out} = 4/3$ is only one point $(1/3, 1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$. The achievability of that point is illustrated in section 3.1. □

Remark 1: **[Synergy benefits]**Note that the DoF for two-user X channel with perfect CSIT is 4/3 [**?**, 17], with delayed CSIT is upper bounded by 6/5 [16] and with No-CSIT is degraded to be unity due to the statistical independence of the two receivers in the total absence of channel state information at the transmitters [**?**]. Synergy is the interaction of multiple elements in a system to produce an effect greater than the sum of their individual effects. In Particular, the alternation of CSIT states S_{ij} over three time slots works cooperatively to provide a DoF greater than the DoF of the sum of their individual DoF for the same network.

As an example, let us consider the CSIT alternation pattern given by (DD, DD, PP). If there is no interaction between the three time slots, the DoF that can be obtained are given by $\frac{2}{3}\frac{6}{5} + \frac{1}{3}\frac{4}{3} = \frac{56}{45}$ which is lower than the upperbound on the DoF of the channel. However, using achievable scheme 2, we can get 4/3 DoF for this case as this CSIT pattern is higher than (DN, ND, PP) in Table 1. This illustrates the synergistic benefit that can be obtained from the alternation of CSIT over the three time slots.

Note that not all combinations of CSIT states could provide synergistic benefits or work together in a cooperative way. For example, when perfect CSIT comes before delayed and no CSIT , it loses its synergetic DoF gain; where, the DoF degrades to the sum of the individual DoF each case. on the other hand, when perfect CSIT comes after delayed and no CSIT, the synergy of the alternation appears.

Remark 2: **[Potential of delayed followed by perfect CSIT]** The extraordinary synergistic gain of delayed CSIT followed by perfect CSIT lies in the ability to upgrade the X channel to a broadcast channel with delayed CSIT. In particular, when the delayed CSIT comes first it provides the transmitters with delayed channel knowledge which combats the distributed nature of the X channel and can be exploited in addition to the perfect CSIT to provide one message to each receiver.

Remark 3: **[Combined No-CSIT]** We note that the synergy of alternating CSIT is lost when the network has combined No-CSIT in any time slot. Intuitively, the uncertainty of distributed channel unawareness is better than blindness of combined complete ignorance. Physically, the strategy of interference creation phase is to create interference for the receiver who can provide the transmitters with CSIT either perfect or delayed to enable the transmitters to reconstruct the interference in the interference resurrection phase. Hence, combined no-CSIT is useless in the interference creation phase as it provides nothing to transmitters and hence the transmitters blindly create interference. While, in the interference resurrection phase, the minimum CSIT required to successfully reconstruct one interference term, formerly created from distributed transmitters, is PN or NP thereby combined no-CSIT again is useless in the interference resurrection phase as it provides nothing to transmitters and hence the transmitters can not reconstruct the interference terms. As Martin Luther king said before "Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that."

Remark 4: **[Redundant Knowledge]** Unlike what have been thought in the literature that the achievability of the upper bound on the degrees of freedom of X channel requires global and continuous prefect CSIT $\equiv \Lambda(1,0,0)$, The first condition for achievability in theory 1 clarify that it requires alternating CSIT with distribution $\Lambda(1/3,1/3,1/3)$. Fig. 1 illustrates that there is a huge redundant CSIT greedily consumed or misused in the conventional schemes. Hence, the region bounded by the red and black bold borders in Fiq.1 represent all distribution that achieves $DoF = 4/3$, while the minimum CSIT is $\Lambda(1/3,1/3,1/3)$, $\Lambda(1,0,0)$ has the highest redundant knowledge. However, our proposed scheme consumes the CSIT wisely and no overhead information are sent or received **??**, we have no evident to evaluate that either $\Lambda(1/3,1/3,1/3)$ is the the distribution of the minimum CSIT knowledge to achieve the upper bound on the degrees of freedom of X channel or not. Therefore, the distribution of the minimum CSIT knowledge to achieve the upper bound on the degrees of freedom of X channel is still unknown.

4 K-user SISO X-Network

Motivated by our previous work in [**?**, 18], we extend the interference creation-resurrection scheme tailored originally for the two-user SISO X-channel to K-user X channel under the model for the CSIT availability; synergistic alternating CSIT.

In this section, we propose a transmission scheme for the K-user SISO X-channel. Similarly to [18], the transmission scheme involves two phases, namely, interference creation and interference resurrection. The basic idea behind the proposed achievable scheme inspired by Maddah Ali in [**?**]. Specifically, in MSIO BC with delayed CIST, transmitting date symbols to one receiver, inherently implies receiving interference at the other receivers. Due to delayed CSI, after some delay, the transmitter has access to both past CSI and transmitted symbols and hence it perfectly knows the whole past received terms at each receiver. Imagine if each interference term at a receiver is a useful piece of information for specific other receivers about their desired symbols. Therefore, re-transmission of each of such interference terms not only aligns the past interference at one receiver, but also provides another receivers with a desired piece of information. on the other hand, in the context of X-channel, due to the distributed nature of the transmitter, the network loses the privileged of the joint processing of the transmitted signals at the collocated transmitters. However, in [18], the authors showed that the distributed nature of X-channel can be defeated by exploiting the synergistic benefits of the alternating CSIT; the delayed state and the perfect state. Utilizing this idea, here we show that the K-user SISO X-channel can achieve at least $\frac{2K}{K+1}$ DoF.

Before we proceed to the K-user case, as an illustrative example, we show that for the 3-user SISO X channel with alternating CSIT of $\Lambda(1/3,1/3,1/3)$ can achieve 3/2 DoF. Let u_1, u_2 and u_3 be

three independent data symbol intended to R_1 transmitted from T_1, T_2 and T_3, respectively. Also, let v_1, v_2 and v_3 be three independent data symbols intended to R_2 transmitted from T_1, T_2 and T_3, respectively. Similarly , p_1, p_2 and p_3 be three independent data symbols intended to R_3 transmitted from T_1, T_2 and T_3, respectively. In the next subsections, we show that we can reliably transmit the three symbols (u_1, u_2, u_3) to receiver 1, (v_1, v_2, v_3) to receiver 2 and, finally, (p_1, p_2, p_3) to receiver 3 in 6 time slots.

Let us consider the alternating CSIT pattern given by $S^6_{123} = (NDD, DND, DDN, PPN, PDP, DPP)$. Here, the delayed CSIT is distributed over three time slots. Consequently, the interference creation phase consumes three time slots while the interference resurrection phase is executed over the other three time slot. The proposed scheme is performed in two separate phases as follows.

Phase one:, interference creation, each time slot of this phase is dedicated to each receiver where the transmitters transmit three different linear combinations of the desired messages, one term to each receiver. Since $S_{123}(1) = NDD$, the first time slot is designed such that interference is created for R_2 and R_3, hence, T_1 transmits u_1, T_2 transmits u_2 and T_3. The received signals at R_1, R_2 and R_3 are given respectively by

$$Y_1(1) = h_{11}(1)u_1 + h_{12}(1)u_2 + h_{13}(1)u_3 \equiv L^1_1(u_1, u_2, u_3) \tag{37}$$
$$Y_2(1) = h_{21}(1)u_1 + h_{22}(1)u_2 + h_{23}(1)u_3 \equiv I^1_2(u_1, u_2, u_3) \tag{38}$$
$$Y_3(1) = h_{31}(1)u_1 + h_{32}(1)u_2 + h_{33}(1)u_3 \equiv I^1_3(u_1, u_2, u_3) \tag{39}$$

Therefore, R_1 receives the linear combination $L^1_1(u_1, u_2, u_3)$ of its desired signals, while R_2 and R_3 receives only interference terms; $I^1_2(u_1, u_2, u_3)$ and $I^1_3(u_1, u_2, u_3)$. Similarly, in the next two time slots, T_1 transmits v_1, T_2 transmits v_2 and T_3 transmits v_3 in the second time slots while T_1 transmits p_1, T_2 transmits p_2 and T_3 transmits p_3 in the third time slot. Then, the received signals at R_1, R_2 and R_3 are given respectively by

$$Y_1(2) = h_{11}(2)v_1 + h_{12}(2)v_2 + h_{13}(2)v_3 \equiv I^1_1(v_1, v_2, v_3) \tag{40}$$
$$Y_2(2) = h_{21}(2)v_1 + h_{22}(2)v_2 + h_{23}(2)v_3 \equiv I^1_2(v_1, v_2, v_3) \tag{41}$$
$$Y_3(2) = h_{31}(2)v_1 + h_{32}(2)v_2 + h_{33}(3)v_3 \equiv I^1_3(v_1, v_2, v_3) \tag{42}$$

where R_2 receives the first linear combination $L^1_2(v_1, v_2, v_3)$ of its desired signals, while R_1 and R_3 receives the first interference terms $I^1_2(v_1, v_2, v_3)$ and $I^1_2(v_1, v_2, v_3)$. while in the third time slot,

$$Y_1(3) = h_{11}(3)p_1 + h_{12}(3)p_2 + h_{13}(3)p_3 \equiv I^1_1(p_1, p_2, p_3) \tag{43}$$
$$Y_2(3) = h_{21}(3)p_1 + h_{22}(3)p_2 + h_{23}(3)p_3 \equiv I^1_2(p_1, p_2, p_3)) \tag{44}$$
$$Y_3(3) = h_{31}(3)p_1 + h_{32}(3)p_2 + h_{33}(3)p_3 \equiv L^1_3(p_1, p_2, p_3) \tag{45}$$

where R_3 receives the first linear combination $L^1_3(p_1, p_2, p_3)$ of its desired signals, while R_1 and R_2 receives the first interference terms $I^1_1(p_1, p_2, p_3)$ and $I^1_2(p_1, p_2, p_3)$. By the end of time slot three each receiver receives one linear combination term from it's intended message and as a by product the other two receivers receives two interference terms. Now, we have six interference terms available to the three receivers. In the interference resurrection phase we will utilize these interference terms to provide the receivers with sufficient information to successfully decode their messages, specifically, each receiver needs another two linear combinations. Trivially, it requires six time slots to deliver six independent linear combinations. However, as we will show in the following that it will takes only three time slots by using the interference resurrection; exploiting interference as a common messages.

Phase two: In the fourth time slot, interference resurrection phase begins, the transmitters utilizes the channel knowledge in PPN to reconstruct $I^1_2(u_1, u_2, u_3)$ at R_2 while reconstructing $I^1_1(v_1, v_2, v_3)$ at R_1. As a result, R_1 and R_2 receive their second linear combination terms $L^2_1(u_1, u_2, u_3)$and

$L_2^2(v_1, v_2, v_3)$ while R_3 receives pure interference. In particular, The transmitted signals are given by:

$$X_1(4) = h_{21}^{-1}(4)h_{21}(1)u_1 + h_{11}^{-1}(4)h_{11}(2)v_1 \quad (46)$$
$$X_2(4) = h_{22}^{-1}(4)h_{22}(1)u_2 + h_{12}^{-1}(4)h_{12}(2)v_2 \quad (47)$$
$$X_3(4) = h_{23}^{-1}(4)h_{23}(1)u_3 + h_{13}^{-1}(4)h_{13}(2)v_3 \quad (48)$$

Note that the transmitted signals, in interference resurrection phase, are beam-formed signals-not random linear combinations like in interference creation phase-dependent on both the current channel knowledge and the outdated channel knowledge formerly received at interference creation phase. For an instance, to construct $X_1(4)$, T_1 utilizes the instantaneous knowledge of $h_11(4)$ and the delayed knowledge of $h_11(2)$.

Therefore, the received signals at R_1, R_2 and R_2 are given respectively by

$$Y_1(4) \equiv I_1^1(v_1, v_2, v_3) + L_1^2(u_1, u_2, u_3) \quad (49)$$
$$Y_2(4) \equiv I_2^1(u_1, u_2, u_3) + L_2^2(v_1, v_2, v_3) \quad (50)$$
$$Y_3(4) \equiv I_3^2(u_1, u_2, u_3) + I_3^2(v_1, v_2, v_3) \quad (51)$$

In the fifth time slot, interference resurrection phase for user one and user three begins, the transmitters utilizes the channel knowledge in PNP to reconstruct $I_3^1(u_1, u_2, u_3)$ at R_3 while reconstructing $I_1^1(p_1, p_2, p_3)$ at R_1. As a result, R_1 receives it's third linear combination term $L_1^3(u_1, u_2, u_3)$ and R_3 receives it's second interference term $L_3^2(p_1, p_2, p_3)$ while R_2 receives pure interference. In particular, The transmitted signals are given by:

$$X_1(5) = h_{31}^{-1}(5)h_{31}(1)u_1 + h_{11}^{-1}(5)h_{11}(3)p_1 \quad (52)$$
$$X_2(5) = h_{32}^{-1}(5)h_{32}(1)u_2 + h_{12}^{-1}(5)h_{12}(3)p_2 \quad (53)$$
$$X_3(5) = h_{33}^{-1}(5)h_{33}(1)u_3 + h_{13}^{-1}(5)h_{13}(3)p_3 \quad (54)$$

As a result, the received signals at R_1, R_2 and R_2 are given respectively by:

$$Y_1(5) \equiv I_1^1(p_1, p_2, p_3) + L_1^3(u_1, u_2, u_3) \quad (55)$$
$$Y_2(5) \equiv I_2^2(u_1, u_2, u_3) + I_2^2(p_1, p_2, p_3) \quad (56)$$
$$Y_3(5) \equiv I_3^1(u_1, u_2, u_3) + L_3^2(p_1, p_2, p_3) \quad (57)$$

In the sixth time slot, interference resurrection phase for usder two and user three begins, the transmitters utilizes the channel knowledge in NPP to reconstruct $I_2^1(p_1, p_2, p_3)$ at R_2 while reconstructing $I_3^1(v_1, v_2, v_3)$ at R_3. As a result, R_2 and R_3 receive their second linear combination terms $L_2^2(v_1, v_2, v_3)$ and $L_3^2(u_1, u_2, u_3)$ while R_1 receives pure interference. In particular, The transmitted signals are given by:

$$X_1(6) = h_{31}^{-1}(6)h_{31}(2)v_1 + h_{21}^{-1}(6)h_{21}(3)p_1 \quad (58)$$
$$X_2(6) = h_{32}^{-1}(6)h_{32}(2)v_2 + h_{22}^{-1}(6)h_{22}(3)p_2 \quad (59)$$
$$X_3(6) = h_{33}^{-1}(6)h_{33}(2)v_3 + h_{23}^{-1}(6)h_{23}(3)p_3 \quad (60)$$

As a result, the received signals at R_1, R_2 and R_2 are given respectively by

$$Y_1(6) \equiv L_1^2(u_1, u_2, u_3) + I_1^1(v_1, v_2, v_3) \quad (61)$$
$$Y_2(6) \equiv I_2^1(u_1, u_2, u_3) + L_2^2(v_1, v_2, v_3) \quad (62)$$
$$Y_3(6) \equiv I_3^2(u_1, u_2, u_3) + I_3^2(v_1, v_2, v_3) \quad (63)$$

Theorem 4: The DoF of the K-user SISO X channel with synergistic alternating CSIT under any distribution $\in \Lambda(\lambda_P \geq 1/3, \lambda_D \geq 2/3 - \lambda_P)$ is Lower bounded as follows:

$$DoF^X_{K\times K}(\lambda_P \geq 1/3, \lambda_D \geq 2/3 - \lambda_P) \geq \frac{K^2}{K + \binom{K}{2}} = \frac{2K}{K+1} \tag{64}$$

Proof. The transmission scheme starts with transmission of information symbols in phase one, the interference creation phase, in a certain way that guarantees to create reconstructable interference terms while providing receivers with linear combinations of their intended data symbols. This phase consumes K time slots to deliver K different linear combination of the data symbols to K different receivers while creating $K * (K-1)$ reconstructable interference terms. In contrast, phase two, the interference creation phase, This phase consumes $\binom{K}{2}$ time slots to delivers $K * (K-1)$ new linear combinations of the data symbols to the indented receivers in oreder to successfully decode K^2 data symbols.

Phase One: "Interference Creation": This phase is associated with the delayed CSIT and might have one to K sub-phases where each sub-phase consumes one time slot. The number of sub-phases depends on whether the delayed CSIT of the channels to the two receivers occurs simultaneously or not. In the first case where the delayed CSIT occurs in the same time slot, i.e., $S_{1\cdots K} = D \cdots D$, phase one has only one sub-phase in which all data symbols are greedily transmitted, thus *interference creation* happens. Consequently, each receiver has one equation consisting of K terms, the first term is a linear combination from the desired symbols while others are the interference term. On the other hand, when the delayed CSIT do not occur simultaneously, i.e., $S_{1\cdots K} \in \{D \cdots N, N \cdots D, D \cdots P, P \cdots D\}$, phase one includes number of sub-phases greater than one. Each sub-phase is dedicated to transmit the data symbols of one receiver. Consequently, each receiver has K different equations over K time slots, one of them is a linear combination of the desired symbols without interference and the others are interference terms only.

Phase Two: "Interference Resurrection": This phase is associated with perfect CSIT. Similar to phase one, this phase might have one or two sub-phases depending on whether the perfect the CSIT occurs simultaneously or not. In this phase, the transmitters reconstruct the old interference by exploiting the delayed CSIT received in phase one. When the two transmitters have perfect CSIT simultaneously, phase two has only one sub-phase in which the two transmitters reconstruct the old interference received in phase one. Then, the transmitters transmit two independent messages exploiting the combined perfect CSIT. On the other hand, when the perfect CSIT is distributed over two time slots, phase two consists of two sub-phases where each sub-phase is dedicated to resurrect the interference for one receiver. Unlike combined perfect CSIT, transmitters consume two time slots to totally reconstruct the old interference and provide new linear combination of the desired symbols to the receivers. □

Note that this bound is tight for $K = 2$, for which the two user X-channel achieves the upper bound on the DoF of 4/3. However, the lower bound state in Theorem 4 does not scale with K, it is strictly better than the best known lower bound for the network with only delayed CSIT $\Lambda(0,1,0)$, DoF $\geq \frac{4}{3} - \frac{3}{2(2k-1)}$ for all values of K [16].

5 $K \times 2$-user SISO X-Network

In this section, we characterize the degrees of freedom of the $K \times 2$-user SISO X-Network with synergistic alternating CSIT. To this extent, first, we provide the achievability schemes to 3×2 and 4×2



Figure 4: $K \times 2$-user SISO X network

SISO X channel as illustrative examples. Then, we generalize our acheivability scheme to the K-user case.

A. Consider a 3×2-user X network with synergistic alternation under certain distribution; $\Lambda(1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$.In order to achieve 4/3 DoF, similar to the aforementioned schemes, the transmission strategy is executed in two distinctive phases; Interference creation and Interference resurrection phases, nevertheless, with minor modifications. Typically, the information symbols are avidity fed to some receivers in the interference creation phase in a form of random linear combinations while creating interference to the other receivers. During the interference resurrection phase, the old interference terms, formerly created, are sent as a new linear combinations to the some receivers, ensuing interference alignment to other receivers. By the end, all the receivers have the desired number of equations in terms of their intended information symbols. In particular, to achieve 4/3 DoF, We send six independent symbols to each receiver over nine time slots and the alternating CSIT pattern is given by $S_{12}^{9} = (DD, DD, DD, PN, PN, PN, NP, NP, NP)$. Here, the delayed CSIT is collocated over three time slots. Consequently, the interference creation phase consumes three time slots to generate six linear combinations and six independent interference terms,three per each receiver, while the interference resurrection phase is executed over the other six time slots to align the six interference terms formerly created and ,as by product, generate new three linear combinations to each receiver. The proposed scheme is performed in two separate phases as follows.

Phase one:, interference creation, unlike previous interference creation phases in previous schemes, here, each time slot of this phase is dedicated to both the receivers (send random linear combinations from the desired signals and create interference for both receiver simultaneously) where we send four different information symbols two for each receiver in each time slot. Since $S_{12}^{3} = (DD, DD, DD)$, each time slot is designed such that interference is created for R_1 and R_2, hence, T_1 transmits u_1^1 and v_1^1, T_2 transmits v_2^1, and T_3 transmits u_3^1. The received signals at R_1 and R_2 are given respectively by :

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(1) &= h_{11}(1)u_1^1 + h_{13}(1)u_3^1 + h_{11}(1)v_1^1 + h_{12}(1)v_2^1 && (65)\\ &\equiv L_1^1(u_1^1, u_3^1) + I_1^1(v_1^1, v_2^1) && (66)\\ Y_2(1) &= h_{21}(1)u_1^1 + h_{23}(1)u_3^1 + h_{21}(1)v_1^1 + h_{22}(1)v_2^1 && (67)\\ &\equiv I_2^1(u_1^1, u_3^1) + L_2^1(v_1^1, v_2^1) && (68) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, R_1 receives the first linear combination $L_1^1(u_1^1, u_3^1)$ of its desired signals in addition to interference term $I_1^1(v_1^1, v_2^1)$, while R_2 receives the first linear combination $L_2^1(v_1^1, v_2^1)$ of its desired signals along with interference term; $I_2^1(u_1^1, u_3^1)$. Similarly, in the next two time slots, T_1 transmits u_1^2, T_2 transmits u_2^1 and v_2^2, and T_3 transmits v_3^1 in the second time slots while T_1 transmits v_1^2, T_2 transmits u_2^2 and T_3 transmits u_3^2 and v_3^2 in the third time slot. As a result, the received signals at R_1

and R_2 are given respectively by

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(2) &= h_{11}(2)u_1^2 + h_{13}(2)u_2^1 + h_{11}(2)v_2^2 + h_{12}(2)v_3^1 && (69)\\ &\equiv L_2^1(u_1^1, u_3^1) + I_1^2(v_1^1, v_2^1) && (70)\\ Y_2(2) &= h_{21}(2)u_1^2 + h_{23}(2)u_2^1 + h_{21}(2)v_2^2 + h_{22}(2)v_3^1 && (71)\\ &\equiv I_2^2(u_2^1, u_1^2) + L_2^2(v_3^1, v_2^2) && (72)\\ Y_1(3) &= h_{12}(3)u_2^2 + h_{13}(3)u_3^2 + h_{11}(3)v_1^2 + h_{13}(3)v_3^2 && (73)\\ &\equiv L_1^3(u_2^2, u_3^2) + I_1^3(v_1^2, v_3^2) && (74)\\ Y_2(3) &= h_{22}(3)u_2^2 + h_{23}(3)u_3^2 + h_{21}(3)v_1^2 + h_{23}(3)v_3^2 && (75)\\ &\equiv I_2^3(u_2^2, u_3^2) + L_2^3(v_1^2, v_3^2) && (76) \end{aligned}$$

where R_3 receives the first linear combination $L_3^1(p_1, p_2, p_3)$ of its desired signals, while R_1 and R_2 receives the first interference terms $I_1^1(p_1, p_2, p_3)$ and $I_2^1(p_1, p_2, p_3)$.

By the end of time slot three each receiver receives three linear combination terms from it's intended information symbols along with three interference terms. Now, we have six interference terms available to the two receivers. Then, the interference resurrection phase takes these interference terms to generate six common messages between the two receivers. Resurrecting interference terms is beneficial to the two receivers; one receiver utilize it by eliminating the interference terms from it's received signals in phase one while the other receiver receive it as a new linear combination from its information symbols. After, the interference resurrection phase the receivers has access to sufficient information to successfully decode their messages, specifically, each receiver needs six independent linear combinations from its information symbols.

Phase two: In the fourth time slot, interference resurrection phase begins, the transmitters utilizes the channel knowledge in PN to reconstruct $I_1^1(v_1^1, v_2^1)$ at R_1. As a result, R_2 receives the fourth linear combination term $L_2^4(v_1^1, v_2^1)$ while R_1 extracts its first linear combination term $L_1^1(u_1^1, u_3^1)$ by subtracting $Y_1(4)$ from $Y_1(1)$. In particular, The transmitted signals are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1(4) &= h_{11}^{-1}(4)h_{11}(1)v_1^1 && (77)\\ X_2(4) &= h_{12}^{-1}(4)h_{12}(1)v_2^1 && (78)\\ & && (79) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the transmitted signals, in interference resurrection phase, are beam-formed signals-not random linear combinations like in interference creation phase, dependent on both the current channel knowledge and the outdated channel knowledge formerly received at interference creation phase. For an instance, to construct $X_1(4)$, T_1 utilizes the instantaneous knowledge of $h_11(4)$ and the delayed knowledge of $h_11(1)$. Therefore, the received signals at R_1, R_2 and R_2 are given respectively by

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(4) &\equiv I_1^1(v_1^1, v_2^1) && (80)\\ Y_2(4) &= h_{21}(4)h_{11}^{-1}(4)h_{11}(1)v_1^1 + h_{22}(4)h_{12}^{-1}(4)h_{12}(1)v_2^1 \\ &\equiv L_4^2(v_1^1, v_2^1) && (81) \end{aligned}$$

In the fifth time slot, interference resurrection phase for user 2, the transmitters utilizes the channel knowledge in PN to reconstruct the interference term $I_2^1(u_1^1, u_3^1)$ at R_2. As a result, R_2 receives the same interference term received at time slot one and thereby R_2 extracts its first linear combination term $L_2^1(v_1^1, v_2^1)$ by subtracting $Y_5(3)$ from $Y_2(1)$ while, as a by product, R_1 receives it's fourth linear combination term $L_1^4(u_1^1, u_3^1)$. In particular, The transmitted signals are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1(5) &= h_{21}^{-1}(5)h_{21}(1)u_1^1 && (82)\\ X_3(5) &= h_{23}^{-1}(5)h_{23}(1)u_3^1 && (83) \end{aligned}$$

As a result, the received signals at R_1 and R_2 are given respectively by:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(5) &= h_{11}(5)h_{21}^{-1}(5)h_{21}(1)u_1^1 + h_{13}(5)h_{23}^{-1}(5)h_{23}(1)u_3^1 \\ &\equiv L_1^4(u_1^1, u_3^1) \quad (84) \\ Y_2(5) &\equiv I_2^1(u_1^1, u_3^1) \quad (85) \end{aligned}$$

In the six time slot, the transmitters utilizes the channel knowledge in PN to reconstruct $I_1^2(v_2^2, v_3^1)$ at R_1. As a result, R_2 receives the fifth linear combination term $L_2^5(v_2^2, v_3^1)$ while R_1 extracts its second linear combination term $L_1^2(u_1^2, u_2^1)$ by subtracting $Y_1(6)$ from $Y_1(2)$. In particular, The transmitted signals are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} X_2(6) &= h_{12}^{-1}(6)h_{12}(2)v_2^2 \quad (86) \\ X_3(6) &= h_{13}^{-1}(6)h_{13}(2)v_3^1 \quad (87) \\ & \quad (88) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the received signals at R_1 and R_2 are given respectively by:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(6) &\equiv I_1^2(v_2^2, v_3^1) \quad (89) \\ Y_2(6) &= h_{22}(6)h_{12}^{-1}(6)h_{12}(2)v_2^2 + h_{23}(6)h_{13}^{-1}(6)h_{13}(2)v_3^1 \\ &\equiv L_5^2(v_2^2, v_3^1) \quad (90) \end{aligned}$$

In the seventh time slot, interference resurrection phase for user two, the transmitters utilizes the channel knowledge in NP to reconstruct the interference term $I_2^2(u_1^2, u_2^1)$ at R_2. As a result, R_2 receives the same interference term received at time slot two and thereby R_2 able to extract its second linear combination term $L_2^2(v_2^2, v_3^1)$ by subtracting $Y_2(7)$ from $Y_2(2)$ while, as a by product, R_1 receives it's fifth linear combination term $L_1^5(u_1^2, u_2^1)$. In particular, The transmitted signals are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1(7) &= h_{21}^{-1}(7)h_{21}(2)u_1^2 \quad (91) \\ X_2(7) &= h_{22}^{-1}(7)h_{22}(2)u_2^1 \quad (92) \end{aligned}$$

As a result, the received signals at R_1 and R_2 are given respectively by:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(7) &= h_{11}(7)h_{21}^{-1}(5)h_{21}(1)u_1^2 + h_{12}(7)h_{22}^{-1}(7)h_{22}(1)u_2^1 \\ &\equiv L_1^4(u_1^2, u_2^1) \quad (93) \\ Y_2(7) &\equiv I_2^2(u_1^2, u_2^1) \quad (94) \end{aligned}$$

In the eighth time slot, the transmitters utilizes the channel knowledge in PN to reconstruct $I_1^2(v_1^2, v_3^2)$ at R_1. As a result, R_2 receives the sixth linear combination term $L_2^6(v_1^2, v_3^2)$ while R_1 extracts its third linear combination term $L_1^3(u_2^2, u_3^2)$ by subtracting $Y_1(8)$ from $Y_1(3)$. In particular, The transmitted signals are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1(8) &= h_{11}^{-1}(8)h_{11}(3)v_1^2 \quad (95) \\ X_3(8) &= h_{13}^{-1}(8)h_{13}(3)v_3^2 \quad (96) \\ & \quad (97) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the received signals at R_1 and R_2 are given respectively by:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(8) &\equiv I_3^2(v_1^2, v_3^2) \quad (98) \\ Y_2(8) &= h_{21}(8)h_{11}^{-1}(8)h_{11}(3)v_1^2 + h_{23}(8)h_{13}^{-1}(8)h_{13}(3)v_3^2 \\ &\equiv L_6^2(v_1^2, v_3^2) \quad (99) \end{aligned}$$

In the ninth time slot, interference resurrection phase for user two, the transmitters utilizes the channel knowledge in NP to reconstruct the interference term $I_2^2(u_2^2, u_3^2)$ at R_2. As a result, R_2 receives the same interference term received at time slot two and thereby R_2 able to extract its third linear combination term $L_2^3(u_2^2, u_3^2)$ by subtracting $Y_2(9)$ from $Y_2(3)$ while, as a by product, R_1 receives it's sixth linear combination term $L_1^6(u_2^2, u_3^2)$. In particular, The transmitted signals are given by:

$$X_2(9) = h_{22}^{-1}(9)h_{22}(3)u_2^2 \tag{100}$$
$$X_3(9) = h_{23}^{-1}(9)h_{23}(3)u_3^2 \tag{101}$$

As a result, the received signals at R_1 and R_2 are given respectively by:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(9) &= h_{12}(9)h_{22}^{-1}(9)h_{22}(3)u_2^2 + h_{13}(9)h_{23}^{-1}(9)h_{23}(3)u_3^2 \\ &\equiv L_1^4(u_2^2, u_3^2) \end{aligned} \tag{102}$$
$$Y_2(9) \equiv I_3^2(u_2^2, u_3^2) \tag{103}$$

By the end of the ninth slot, each receiver has access to sufficient information to successfully decode it's symbols, specifically, each receiver has six independent equations (linear combinations)in six variables and six interference terms aligned in three dimensions.

B. Achievability scheme to even number of transmitters: Consider a 4×2-user X network with synergistic alternation under certain distribution; $\Lambda(1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$.In order to achieve 4/3 DoF, similar to the aforementioned schemes, the transmission strategy is executed in two distinctive phases; Interference creation and Interference resurrection phases, nevertheless, without duplicating the number of transmitted symbols. In particular, to achieve 4/3 DoF, We send six independent symbols to each receiver over nine time slots and the alternating CSIT pattern is given by $S_{12}^9 = (DD, DD, DD, PN, PN, PN, NP, NP, NP)$. Here, the delayed CSIT is collocated over two time slots. Consequently, the interference creation phase consumes two time slots to generate four linear combinations and four independent interference terms,three per each receiver, while the interference resurrection phase is executed over the other four time slots to align the four interference terms formerly created and ,as a by product, generate new two linear combinations to each receiver. The proposed scheme is performed in two separate phases as follows.

Phase one:, interference creation, unlike previous interference creation phases in previous schemes, here, each time slot of this phase is dedicated to both the receivers (send random linear combinations from the desired signals and create interference for both receiver simultaneously) where we send four different information symbols two for each receiver in each time slot. Since, $S_{12}^2 = (DD, DD)$, each time slot is designed such that interference is created for R_1 and R_2, hence, T_1 transmits u_1, T_2 transmits u_2 and v_2, and T_3 transmits v_3. The received signals at R_1 and R_2 are given respectively by :

$$Y_1(1) = h_{11}(1)u_1 + h_{12}(1)u_2 + h_{12}(1)v_2 + h_{13}(1)v_3 \tag{104}$$
$$\equiv L_1^1(u_1, u_2) + I_1^1(v_2, v_3) \tag{105}$$
$$Y_2(1) = h_{21}(1)u_1 + h_{22}(1)u_2 + h_{22}(1)v_2 + h_{23}(1)v_3 \tag{106}$$
$$\equiv I_2^1(u_1, u_2) + L_2^1(v_2, v_3) \tag{107}$$

Therefore, R_1 receives the first linear combination $L_1^1(u_1, u_2)$ of its desired signals in addition to interference term $I_1^1(v_2, v_3)$, while R_2 receives the first linear combination $L_2^1(v_2, v_3)$ of its desired signals along with interference term; $I_2^1(u_2, u_2)$. Similarly, in the next time slots, T_3 transmits u_3, T_4 transmits u_4 and v_4, and T_1 transmits v_1. As a result, the received signals at R_1 and R_2 are given respectively by

$$
\begin{aligned}
Y_1(2) &= h_{13}(2)u_3 + h_{14}(2)u_4 + h_{11}(2)v_1 + h_{14}(2)v_4 && (108)\\
&\equiv L_2^1(u_3, u_4) + I_1^2(v_1, v_4) && (109)\\
Y_2(2) &= h_{23}(2)u_3 + h_{24}(2)u_4 + h_{21}(2)v_1 + h_{24}(2)v_4 && (110)\\
&\equiv I_2^2(u_3, u_4) + L_2^2(v_1, v_4) && (111)
\end{aligned}
$$

By the end of time slot two, end of interference creation phase, each receiver receives two linear combination terms from it's intended information symbols along with two interference terms. Now, we have four interference terms available to the two receivers. Then, the interference resurrection phase takes these interference terms to generate four common messages between the two receivers. Resurrecting interference terms is beneficial to the two receivers; one receiver utilize it by eliminating the interference terms from it's received signals in phase one while the other receiver receive it as a new linear combination from its information symbols. After, the interference resurrection phase the receivers has access to sufficient information to successfully decode their messages, specifically, each receiver needs four independent linear combinations from its information symbols.

Phase two: In the third time slot, interference resurrection phase begins and extends for four time slots, here we execute the interference resurrection phase in two separate stages as follows:

Stage one interference resurrection for R_1: the transmitters utilizes the channel knowledge in PN, received in time slot three and four, to reconstruct $I_1^1(v_2, v_3)$ and $I_1^1(v_1, v_4)$ at R_1. As a result, R_2 receives the third and fourth linear combination terms $L_2^3(v_2, v_3)$ and $L_2^4(v_1, v_4)$, respectively , while R_1 extracts its first and second linear combination terms $L_1^1(u_1, u_2)$ and $L_1^2(u_3, u_4)$ by subtracting $Y_1(3)$ from $Y_1(1)$ and $Y_1(4)$ from $Y_1(2)$, respectively. In particular, The transmitted signals are given by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
X_2(3) &= h_{12}^{-1}(3)h_{12}(1)v_2 && (112)\\
X_3(3) &= h_{13}^{-1}(3)h_{13}(1)v_3 && (113)\\
X_1(4) &= h_{11}^{-1}(4)h_{11}(1)v_1 && (114)\\
X_4(4) &= h_{14}^{-1}(4)h_{14}(1)v_4 && (115)\\
& && (116)
\end{aligned}
$$

As a result, the received signals at R_1 and R_2, over the third and fourth time slots, are given respectively by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Y_1(3) &\equiv I_1^2(v_2, v_3) && (117)\\
Y_2(3) &= h_{21}(3)h_{12}^{-1}(3)h_{12}(3)v_2 + h_{23}(3)h_{13}^{-1}(3)h_{13}(2)v_3\\
&\equiv L_2^3(v_2, v_3) && (118)\\
Y_1(4) &\equiv I_1^2(v_1, v_4) && (119)\\
Y_2(4) &= h_{21}(4)h_{11}^{-1}(4)h_{11}(2)v_1 + h_{24}(4)h_{14}^{-1}(4)h_{14}(2)v_4\\
&\equiv L_2^4(v_1, v_4) && (120)
\end{aligned}
$$

Stage two interference resurrection for R_2: In the fifth and sixth time slots, the transmitters utilizes the channel knowledge in PN to reconstruct the interference terms $I_2^1(u_1, u_2)$ and $I_2^2(u_3, u_4)$ at R_2. As a result, R_2 receives the same interference terms received at interference creation phase and thereby R_2 extracts its first and second linear combination term $L_2^1(v_2, v_3)$ and $L_2^2(v_1, v_4)$ by subtracting $Y_2(5)$ from $Y_2(1)$ and $Y_2(6)$ from $Y_2(2)$ while, as a by product, R_1 receives it's third and fourth linear combination terms $L_1^3(u_1, u_2)$ and $L_1^4(u_3, u_4)$(new information). In particular, the transmitted signals

are given by:

$$X_1(5) = h_{21}^{-1}(5)h_{21}(1)u_1 \tag{121}$$
$$X_2(5) = h_{22}^{-1}(5)h_{22}(1)u_2 \tag{122}$$
$$X_3(6) = h_{23}^{-1}(6)h_{23}(1)u_3 \tag{123}$$
$$X_4(6) = h_{23}^{-1}(6)h_{23}(1)u_4 \tag{124}$$

As a result, the received signals at R_1 and R_2, over the fifth and sixth time slots, are given respectively by:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(5) &= h_{11}(5)h_{21}^{-1}(5)h_{21}(1)u_1 + h_{12}(5)h_{22}^{-1}(5)h_{22}(1)u_2 \\ &\equiv L_1^3(u_1, u_2) \end{aligned} \tag{125}$$
$$Y_2(5) \equiv I_2^1(u_1, u_2) \tag{126}$$
$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(6) &= h_{13}(6)h_{23}^{-1}(6)h_{23}(2)u_3 + h_{14}(6)h_{24}^{-1}(5)h_{24}(2)u_4 \\ &\equiv L_1^4(u_3, u_4) \end{aligned} \tag{127}$$
$$Y_2(6) \equiv I_2^2(u_3, u_4) \tag{128}$$

By the end of the sixth time slot, each receiver has access to sufficient information to successfully decode it's information symbols, specifically, each receiver has four independent equations (linear combinations)in four variables and four interference terms seized in only two dimensions.

C. generalization to $K \times 2 - user$ SISO X-Network in this subsection, we describe the extension to the interference creation-resurrection transmission strategy for the $K \times 2$-user SISO X-Channel with synergistic alternating CIST under $\Lambda(1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$. The transmission scheme is a two-phase scheme, like the previous one, but with many stages in each phase. New random linear combination are sent to the receivers in phase one, interference creation phase, in a certain way that guarantee fed the receivers with certain number of equations of the information symbols as well as creating common messages between the receivers; in our case is the interference it self. phase two, interference resurrection, are responsible for delivering the common messages to the receivers and thereby providing each receiver with the required number of equations to successfully decode its intended information symbols. In the $K \times 2 - user$ SISO X-Channel depicted at Fig.**??** each transmitter in the network has an independent message to be communicated to each receiver therefore the network has multiple of $2K$ independent messages communicating between its nodes. This directly implies that each receiver interest in decoding K independent messages over the successful communication time (certain number of time slots of channel uses) consequently each receiver requires K independent equations to resolve it's own messages.

*Phase one:*In the interference creation phase, the K transmitters send their messages in a certain way to provide each receiver with $K/2$ random linear combinations of K information symbols corrupted by $K/2$ interference terms in $K/2$ time slots. Specifically, we divide the $2K$ information symbols available at transmitters into $K/2$ batches; each batch has four different symbols. In each batch, there are two different groups of two symbols, each group has symbols which are intended to certain receiver but generated at different transmitters. This strategy in diving the information symbols guarantee that the interference terms created in phase one are beneficial when resurrecting in phase two. Here, beneficial means that these interference terms can work as a common message for the two receivers. By the end of phase one, each receiver has access to $K/2$ independent linear combinations of its own symbols corrupted with $K/2$ constituent(constructable and beneficial) interference terms.

Phase two: In the interference resurrection phase, the transmitters utilize the delayed CSIT sent in phase one and the instantaneous CSIT to generate and broadcast common messages to the receiver



Figure 5: $2 \times K$-user SISO X network

??

by reconstructing the constituent interference terms formerly received in phase one. In particular, the transmitters generate and send K common messages, $K/2$ messages for each receiver over two stages. Creating one common message(constituent interference term) directly implies providing one receiver with old interference term to extract new linear combination from an interference-corrupted linear combination formerly received in phase one while providing the other receiver with new linear combination. Almost sure, all the transmitters has sufficient channel knowledge to create the common message(old constituent interference term) at certain receiver; the delayed CSIT received in phase one provide the transmitters with the old channel coefficient while the instantaneous CSIT enable them to nullify the effect of current channel coefficient and thereby the old interference term can resurrected. Sending such a common message only consume one time slot consequently the interference resurrection phase consumes K time slots. By the end of phase two each receiver receives $K/2$ new linear combinations of its own symbols in a certain stage while receives $K/2$ constituent interference terms in the other stage, used to extract $K/2$ linear combinations. After delivering all these common messages, every receiver has access to K linear combinations of its intended information symbols. It is proved in (—-) that these K linear combinations are linearly independent almost surely, and thus, each receiver can resolve all it's K information symbols. Hence, the DoF of the $2 \times K$-user SISO X channel with synergistic alternating CSIT is lower bounded as follows:

$$DoF^{X}_{2\times K}(\lambda_P \geq 1/3, \lambda_D \geq 2/3 - \lambda_P) \geq \frac{2K}{K/2 + K} = \frac{4}{3} \tag{129}$$

We note that this lower bound is tight for K=2, for which the two-user X-channel achieve the upper bound on the DoF of 4/3.

6 $2 \times K$-user SISO X-Network

In this section, we characterize the degrees of freedom of the $2 \times K$-user SISO X-Network with synergistic alternating CSIT. To this extent, first, we provide the achievability schemes to 2×3 and 2×4 SISO X network as illustrative examples. Then, we generalize our acheivability scheme to the $2 \times K$-user case.

A. Consider a 2×3-user X network with synergistic alternation under certain distribution; $\Lambda(2/9, 2/9, 5/9)$. In order to achieve 4/3 DoF, similar to the aforementioned schemes, the transmission strategy is executed in two distinctive phases; interference creation and interference resurrection phases, nevertheless, with minor modifications. In particular, to achieve 4/3 DoF, specially in 2×3-case, we send eight independent symbols; four symbols from each transmitter over six time slots and the alternating CSIT pattern is given by $S^{6}_{12} = (NDN, DNN, NND, NDN, PPN, NPP)$. Here, the delayed CSIT is distributive over four time slots. Consequently, the interference creation phase consumes four time

slots to generate four linear combinations and four independent interference terms; one for R_1, two for R_2 and one for R_3, while the interference resurrection phase is executed over the last two time slots to align the four interference terms formerly created and, as by product, generate new linear combinations to each receiver. The proposed scheme is performed in two separate phases as follows.

Phase one:, interference creation, unlike interference creation phases in $K \times 2$-user case, here, each time slot of this phase is dedicated to only one receiver where we send two different information symbols intended to certain receiver in each time slot. Since $S_{12}^4 = (NDN, DNN, NND, NDN)$, each time slot is designed such that interference is created for R_1 or R_2 or R_3 depending on the transmitted signal intended to which receiver, hence, in each time slot of the interference creation phase, T_1 and T_2 transmit information symbols intended to certain receiver. As a result, one receiver receive a linear combination from it's desired symbols (without interference) while the others receive only interference term. Form example, in time slot one, T_1 transmits u_1^1 and T_2 transmits u_1^1, consequently, the received signals are given respectively by :

$$Y_1(1) = h_{11}(1)u_1^1 + h_{12}(1)u_2^1 \equiv L_1^1(u_1^1, u_2^1) \tag{130}$$
$$Y_2(1) = h_{21}(1)u_1^1 + h_{22}(1)u_2^1 \equiv I_2^1(u_1^1, u_2^1) \tag{131}$$
$$Y_3(1) = h_{31}(1)u_1^1 + h_{32}(1)u_2^1 \equiv I_3^1(u_1^1, u_2^1) \tag{132}$$

Therefore, R_1 receives the first linear combination $L_1^1(u_1^1, u_2^1)$ of its desired signals, while R_2 and R_3 receive only interference terms $I_2^1(u_1^1, u_2^1)$ and $I_3^1(u_1^1, u_2^1)$, respectively. Similarly, in the next three time slots, the transmitters send two independent linear combination to R_2 and one linear combination to R_3. In particular, T_1 transmits v_1^1 and T_2 transmits v_2^1 in the second time slots while, in third time slot, T_1 transmits v_1^2 and T_2 transmits v_2^2 after that, in the fourth time slot, the transmitter are dedicated to R_3 i.e. T_1 transmits p_1^1 and T_2 transmits p_2^1. As a result, the received signals at R_1, R_2 and R_3 are given respectively by:

$$Y_1(2) = h_{11}(2)v_1^1 + h_{12}(2)v_2^1 \equiv I_1^1(v_1^1, v_2^1) \tag{133}$$
$$Y_2(2) = h_{21}(2)v_1^1 + h_{22}(2)v_2^1 \equiv L_2^1(v_1^1, v_2^1) \tag{134}$$
$$Y_3(2) = h_{31}(2)v_1^1 + h_{32}(2)v_2^1 \equiv I_3^1(v_1^1, v_2^1) \tag{135}$$
$$Y_1(3) = h_{11}(3)v_1^2 + h_{12}(3)v_2^2 \equiv L_1^2(v_1^2, v_2^2) \tag{136}$$
$$Y_2(3) = h_{21}(3)v_1^2 + h_{22}(3)v_2^2 \equiv L_2^2(v_1^2, v_2^2) \tag{137}$$
$$Y_3(3) = h_{31}(3)v_1^2 + h_{32}(3)v_2^2 \equiv I_3^2(v_1^2, v_2^2) \tag{138}$$
$$Y_1(4) = h_{11}(4)p_1^1 + h_{12}(4)p_2^1 \equiv I_1^1(p_1^1, p_2^1) \tag{139}$$
$$Y_2(4) = h_{21}(4)p_1^1 + h_{22}(4)p_2^1 \equiv I_2^1(p_1^1, p_2^1) \tag{140}$$
$$Y_3(4) = h_{31}(4)p_1^1 + h_{32}(4)p_2^1 \equiv L_3^1(p_1^1, p_2^1) \tag{141}$$

By the end of the fourth time slot receiver one and three receive two linear combination terms from their intended information symbols and four interference terms; two of four are useful interference terms and the others are useless ones. On the other hand, receiver two receives two linear combination terms from it's intended information symbols in addition to two interference terms all of them are useful terms. Now, we have two interference terms available to the second receiver in addition to two interference terms available to receiver one and three. Then, the interference resurrection phase takes the four interference terms to generate two common messages between the receivers. We note that resurrecting interference terms in each time slot is beneficial to two receivers only while the other one receive only interference. Contrary to the role of common messages in $K \times 2$-user scheme, one receiver utilize it by eliminating the interference terms from it's received signals in phase one while the other receiver receive it as a new linear combination from its information symbols, here, common

messages are the sum two terms (old interference terms) where each receivers pair simultaneously receive it as new linear combination from their information symbols after eliminating the interference terms formerly received in the interference creation phase. After the interference resurrection phase, all receivers have access to sufficient information to successfully decode their messages.

Phase two: In the fifth time slot, interference resurrection phase begins, the transmitters utilizes the channel knowledge of PPN, to simultaneously reconstruct $I_1^1(v_1^1, v_2^1)$ at R_1 and $I_2^1(u_1^1, u_2^1)$ at R_2. As a result, R_2 receives the third linear combination term $L_2^3(v_1^1, v_2^1)$ along with old interference term $I_2^1(u_1^1, u_2^1)$ while R_1 receives its second linear combination term $L_1^2(u_1^1, u_2^1)$ in addition to old interference term $I_1^1(v_1^1, v_2^1)$. In particular, The transmitted signals are given by:

$$X_1(5) = h_{21}^{-1}(5)h_{21}(1)u_1^1 + h_{11}^{-1}(5)h_{11}(2)v_1^1 \tag{142}$$
$$X_2(5) = h_{22}^{-1}(5)h_{22}(1)u_2^1 + h_{12}^{-1}(5)h_{12}(2)v_2^2 \tag{143}$$

Therefore, the received signals at R_1, R_2 and R_2 are given respectively by:

$$Y_1(5) = L_1^2(u_1^1, u_2^1) + I_1^1(v_1^1, v_2^1) \tag{144}$$
$$Y_2(5) = L_2^3(v_1^1, v_2^1) + I_2^1(u_1^1, u_2^1) \tag{145}$$
$$Y_3(5) = I_3^3(v_1^1, v_2^1) + I_3^2(u_1^1, u_2^1) \tag{146}$$
$$\tag{147}$$

In the sixth time slot, we continue with interference resurrection phase for R_2 and R_3, similarly the transmitters utilizes the channel knowledge in NPP to make interference resurrection simultaneously possible for R_2 and R_3,in particular, reconstructing the interference term $I_2^1(p_1^1, p_2^1)$ at R_2 and $I_3^1(v_1^2, v_2^2)$ at R_3. As a result, R_2 receives the fourth linear combination term $L_2^4(v_1^2, v_2^2)$ along with old interference term $I_2^1(p_1^1, p_2^1)$ while R_3 receives its second linear combination term $L_3^2(p_1^2, p_2^1)$ in addition to old interference term $I_3^2(v_1^2, v_2^2)$. In particular, The transmitted signals are given by:

$$X_1(6) = h_{21}^{-1}(6)h_{21}(7)p_1^1 + h_{31}^{-1}(6)h_{31}(3)v_1^2 \tag{148}$$
$$X_2(6) = h_{22}^{-1}(6)h_{22}(7)p_2^1 + h_{32}^{-1}(6)h_{32}(3)v_2^2 \tag{149}$$

Therefore, the received signals at R_1, R_2 and R_3 are given respectively by:

$$Y_1(6) = I_1^2(p_1^1, p_2^1) + I_1^3(v_1^3, v_2^3) \tag{150}$$
$$Y_2(6) = L_2^4(v_1^2, v_2^2) + I_2^1(p_1^1, p_2^1) \tag{151}$$
$$Y_3(6) = I_3^2(v_1^2, v_2^2) + L_3^2(p_1^1, p_2^1) \tag{152}$$
$$\tag{153}$$

By the end of the sixth slot, each receiver has access to sufficient information to successfully decode it's symbols, specifically, R_1 and R_3 have two independent equations (linear combinations)in two variables while R_2 has four independent equations in four variables and four interference terms aligned into two dimensions.

B. Achievability scheme to even number of receivers: Consider a 2×4-user X network with synergistic alternation under certain distribution; $\Lambda(1/6, 1/6, 4/6)$. In order to achieve 4/3 DoF, similar to the previous scheme, the transmission strategy is executed in two distinctive phases; interference creation and interference resurrection phases, nevertheless, insert new variables q_1 and q_2 intended to R_4 instead of duplicating the number of transmitted symbols of the second receiver in the 2×3-user scheme. In particular, to achieve 4/3 DoF, We send two independent symbols to each receiver over six time slots and the alternating CSIT pattern is given by $S_{12}^6 = (NDNN, DNNN, NNDN, NNND, PPNN, NNPP)$.

Here also, the delayed CSIT is distributed over four time slots. Consequently, the interference creation phase consumes four time slots to generate four linear combinations and twelve independent interference terms while the interference resurrection phase is executed over the last two time slots to align the four interference terms formerly created and, as a by product, generate new linear combinations to each receiver. The proposed scheme is exactly the same as the previous scheme in 2×3-user case. We note that the required CSIT decreases with K, the number of receivers.

C. generalization to $2 \times K$*-user SISO X-network* in this subsection, we describe the extension to the interference creation-resurrection transmission strategy for the $2 \times K$-user SISO X-Channel with synergistic alternating CIST under $\Lambda(2/3K, 2/3K, (3K-4)/3K)$. The transmission scheme is a two-phase scheme, like the previous one, but with many stages in each phase. New random linear combination are sent to the receivers in phase one, interference creation phase, in a certain way that guarantee fed the receivers with certain number of equations of the information symbols as well as creating common messages between the receivers; in our case is the interference it self. Phase two, interference resurrection, are responsible for delivering the common messages to the receivers and thereby providing each receiver with the required number of equations to successfully decode it's intended information symbols. In the $2 \times K$-user SISO X-network depicted at Fig.**??** each transmitter in the network has an independent message to be communicated to each receiver therefore the network has multiple of $2K$ independent messages communicating between its nodes. This directly implies that each receiver interest in decoding K independent messages over the successful communication time (certain number of time slots of channel uses) consequently each receiver requires K independent equations to resolve it's own messages.

*Phase one:*In the interference creation phase, the K transmitters send their messages in a certain way to provide each receiver with $K/2$ random linear combinations of K information symbols corrupted by $K/2$ interference terms in $K/2$ time slots. Specifically, we divide the $2K$ information symbols available at transmitters into $K/2$ batches; each batch has four different symbols. In each batch, there are two different groups of two symbols, each group has symbols which are intended to certain receiver but generated at different transmitters. This strategy in diving the information symbols guarantee that the interference terms created in phase one are beneficial when resurrecting in phase two. Here, beneficial means that these interference terms can work as a common message for the two receivers. By the end of phase one, each receiver has access to only one linear combination of its own symbols as well as $(K-1)$ reconstructable interference terms.

Phase two: In the interference resurrection phase, the transmitters utilize the delayed CSIT sent in phase one and the instantaneous CSIT to generate and broadcast common messages to the receivers by reconstructing the constituent interference terms formerly received in phase one. In particular, the transmitters generate and send K common messages by adding $2K$ constituent interference terms generated in phase one. Creating one common message(constituent interference term) directly implies providing two receivers with old interference terms along with new linear combination. Almost sure, all the transmitters has sufficient channel knowledge to create the common message(old constituent interference term) at certain receiver; the delayed CSIT received in phase one provide the transmitters with the old channel coefficient while the instantaneous CSIT enable them to nullify the effect of current channel coefficient and thereby the old interference term can resurrected. Sending such a common message only consume one time slot consequently the interference resurrection phase consumes $K/2$ time slots. By the end of phase K receivers receive K new linear combinations. After delivering all these common messages, every receiver has access to 2 linear combinations of its intended information symbols. It is proved in (—-) that these 2 linear combinations are linearly independent almost surely, and thus, each receiver can resolve all it's 2 information symbols. Hence, the DoF of the $2 \times K$-user

SISO X channel with synergistic alternating CSIT is lower bounded as follows:

$$DoF^{X}_{2\times K}(\lambda_P \geq 1/3, \lambda_D \geq 2/3 - \lambda_P) \geq \frac{2K}{K/2+K} = \frac{4}{3} \tag{154}$$

We note that this lower bound is tight for K=2, for which the two-user X-channel achieve the upper bound on the DoF of 4/3.

7 Prior art comparison and discussion

A. Prior Art Here, in this subsection, we recall some prior art in different contexts which our transmission strategy (Interference creation resurrection) builds upon some of them and our achievability results have much in common when compared to their results. In the context of broadcast channel, Maddah-Ali et al. in [19] have recently proposed an new multi-phase transmission scheme that can efficiently utilize the delayed CSIT in fast fading environment; channel coefficients are completely independent over time instances which means that knowing the past channel reveal nothing about the current channel. In particular, they showed that the K-user MISO broadcast channel with delayed CSIT can achieve nontrivial DoF of $\frac{K}{1+1/2+\cdots+1} \geq 1$. In addition, they proved that this is the upper bound to the DoF for that network. This significant gain in DoF is attributed to the intelligent transmission scheme of broadcasting a single of common interest to multiple receivers. The transmission scheme consists of K constitutive phase where phase $k, 1 \leq K \leq K$, broadcast order-k common symbol and generate order $K+1$ common symbol to feed them to the next phase. The transmitters has the ability to effectively generate these common messages because of two main privileges, first, joint signals processing at the transmitters (broadcast channel with K antennas)and secondly the delayed CSIT. Exploiting both privileges, all the transmitters have the access to all information symbols intended to all users as well as all the channel coefficient of all the former time instances therefore the transmitters can easy construct the common symbols(what are called in [19] overheard equations) moreover broadcast different linear combinations of them for different receivers in the same time slots.

On the other hand, in the context of networks of distributed transmitters like X channel, the delayed CSIT is not beneficial as it is in the broadcast channels (collocated transmitters) due to the loss of joint processing of signals at transmitters. In [16], Ghasemi et. al. developed a new transmission strategy principally tailored for the SISO X channel to utilized the delayed CSIT in order to achieve DoF more than one. Interestingly, using that strategy, they showed that the delayed CSIT can provide DoF gain, particularly, the DoF of the K-user SISO X channel is $\frac{4}{3} - \frac{2}{3(3K-1)}$. However this result provide DoF gain bigger that the trivial one, it says that the DoF of the K-user SISO X-channel with delayed CSIT is lower bounded by a fixed number of 4/3. There is a severe DoF loss due to the compound negative impact of the loss of joint signal processing at transmitters (Distributed transmitters) and the delayed CSIT compared to $\frac{K^2}{2K-1}$,the DoF of K-user SISO X channel with perfect CSIT, and $\frac{K}{1+1/2+\cdots+1/K} \approx \frac{K}{ln(K)}$, the DoF of K-user MSIO Broadcast channel with delayed CSIT. Nevertheless, this Ghasemi's scheme provide tight result of 6/5 in the two-user case, 6/5 proved to be the upper bound for the two-user X-channel with delayed CSIT in [20], so far its results in the K-user case still unbounded above.

Using the same approach of creating common messages and broadcasting higher order-symbols, much research work in the literature proposed a new assumptions(works as catalyst in chemical reactions) in addition to the delayed CSIT assumption(main ingredient) in ordered to defeat the distributed nature of X channel and bridge that DoF gap. First, in [21], the authors study the impact of what called Delayed Shannon feedback on the DoF of SISO X channel. The global delayed Shannon feedback is a feedback where all receivers feed the transmitters with the received signals (noisy channel outputs) in addition to the channel states (channel coefficient between each pair) after certain delay in other words each transmitter has access to all channel coefficient as well as all received signals.

Under this strong assumption(huge knowledge accessible to transmitters), it is shown that the K-user SISO X channel with global delayed Shannon feedback achieves $\frac{K}{1+\frac{1}{2}\cdots+\frac{1}{K}}$. On the other hand, under the partial delayed Shannon feedback(each transmitter receives delayed Shannon feedback for it own receiver pair in other words transmitter k has access to the received signal of receiver k as well as it's channel coefficient to receiver k), the sum degrees of freedom is lower bound by $\frac{2K}{K+1}$.

Secondly, in [22], the authors proposed the use of relays to facilitate interference alignment and enhance the achievable DoF of distributed and fully-connected wireless networks, specifically, using a relay with multiple antennas in addition to the delayed CSIT thereby they managed to defeat the distributed nature of X-channel. In particular, they showed that the DoF of the K-user SISO X channel is $\frac{K}{1+\frac{1}{2}\cdots+\frac{1}{K}}$ with $K-$antenna half-duplex relay, where no CSIT at transmitters while global delayed CSI to the relay (means that the channels to the K-antenna relay and the transmitters are available to the relay after certain delay). However,in this model, the transmitters have no CSIT at all, it is reasonable to compare their results to the other results in the literature of X-channel with delayed CSIT as the relay has access to global delayed CSI.

B. Numerical comparison In the lack of tight upper bounds for the $K-$user, $K\times 2$-user and $2\times K-$user SISO X-network under the alternating CSIT assumption, we can not claim any optimality to our achievablility schemes. However, in the following, we present a comprehensive comparison between our achievability schemes and the main schemes in literature of X networks. First, we begin with comparing our achievability schemes and results, under the alternating CSIT assumption, to their peers but under perfect CSIT. Indeed, we recall the results of [2] which present the tightest upper bounds of $\frac{K^2}{2K-1}$ and $\frac{2K}{K+1}$ for the K-user and $2\times K$-user or $K\times 2$-user SISO X network with perfect CSIT, respectively. In addition to these upper bounds, the authors developed an asymptotic interference alignment scheme for the $M\times N$-user SISO X network (K-user when $M=N$), which partially align the interference to asymptotically achieve the previous upper bound within a constant gap, i.e. $\epsilon>0$, over infinite channel extension. Specifically, they constructed an achievable scheme to achieve $(M-1)Nn^{\Gamma}+N(n+1)^{\Gamma}$ DoF over a $(M-1)Nn^{\Gamma}+N(n+1)^{\Gamma}$ symbol extension of the channel, where $\Gamma=(M-1)(N-1)$ so that the achievable DoF are arbitrary close to $\frac{MN}{M+N-1}$ when $n\longrightarrow\infty$. For sake of comparison, the number of time slot in the channel extension to achieve certain DoF, i.e., $\frac{2K}{K+1}$ DoF, the maximum achievable DoF for our scheme 3, is a good metric of practical communication schemes however the partial interference alignment based scheme can more DoF. To achieve $\frac{2K}{K+1}$ DoF for the K-user SISO X network using the achievable scheme of [2], it requires sending $K(K-1)n^{(K-1)^2}+K(n+1)^{(K-1)^2}$ over a $(K-1)n^{(K-1)^2}+K(n+1)^{(K-1)^2}$ symbol channel extension and perfect CSIT while our scheme 3 simply send K^2 independent messages over $(K+\binom{K}{2})$. As an example, for 3-user SISO X-channel, to achieve 3/2 DoF, it requires almost sending 9365 message over 6243 time slots while our scheme requires sending 9 messages over 6 time slots. Moreover, our since the achievable scheme essentially creates K^2 point-to-point links over a $(K+\binom{K}{2})$ symbol extension of the channel, it provides an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ capacity characterization of the K-user X network while the asymptomatic interference alignment scheme only yields a capacity characterization within $\mathcal{O}(log(SNR))$.

Secondly, in [16], Ghasemi and et. al., showed the possibility of distributed retrospective interference alignment for the K-user SISO X network with delayed CSIT. They proposed a two-phase transmission scheme to tackle the main bottle nick of the distributed network; loss of joint signal processing of the signals at transmitters(each transmitter has access only to its own symbols). In particular, it proved that the K-user SISO X network can achieve $\frac{4}{3}-\frac{2}{3(3K-1)}$ DoF under the delayed CSIT assumption. However it was proved in [20] that this result is tight for $K=2$, there is no evidence so far to confirm that for$K>2$. Trivially, our achievablility result for the K-user case is strictly higher than this one, i.e., for our case, the achievable DoF$\longrightarrow 2$ while for Ghassmi scheme tends to 4/3 when $K\longrightarrow\infty$.

C. Conjecture of DoF Scaling Our achievable degrees of freedom for the K-user, $K \times 2$-user and $2 \times K$-user SISO X-network under the alternating CSIT assumption are tight for $K = 2$, for which we achieve the upper bound of DoF of 4/3 for the SISO X-channel with perfect CSIT. Moreover, in light of *Remark 2*, the impact of synergy between instantaneous CSIT and delayed CSIT on enhancing the achievable degrees of freedom of the two user SISO X channel by defeating the distributed nature of the X channel in the transmitters side. In other words, this synergy enables virtual joint signal processing at transmitters, thereby upgrading the two-user X channel with synergistic alternating CSIT to two-user MISO broadcast channel with delayed CSIT. Therefore, these insights pose that the synergistic alternating CSIT, in terms of characterizing the DoF, could enhance the K-user SISO X network a K-user MISO broadcast channel with delayed CSIT as it is beneficial in the two-user case. Consequently, we conjecture that, under the synergistic alternating CSIT with $\Lambda(1/3, 1/3, 1/3)$, the K-user SISO X-channel can achieve $\frac{K}{1+\frac{1}{2}}$, the upper bound on the degrees of freedom of the K-user MSIO broadcast channel with delayed CSIT. However, it does not seem to be possible through our achivability schemes (two-phase schemes), we believe that the multi-phase schemes have many things to offer to the K-user SISO X Networks with synergistic alternating CSIT. Indeed, multi-phase achievebility schemes are perfect match to the multi-interferer nature of K-user X networks.

8 Conclusion

We investigated the synergistic benefits of alternating CSIT for the two-user X-channel and K-user networks. Specifically, We proposed two-phase IA schemes and obtained new achievable results on the DoF of the two-user SISO X channel, $K \times 2$-user, $2 \times K$-user and K-user SISO X-networks under synergistic alternating CSIT assumption. Most of our results are achievable DoF results. Even though an upper bound was shown to be tight in the two-user X-channel, it is not generally sufficient to characterize the outer bound on the DoF of the K-user case. It is worth mentioning that the only known upper bound in the literature on the DoF of channels with delayed CSIT, to our knowledge, is for the K-user MISO BC. However it is proved to be tight, it's extension to other channels seems to be not a straightforward task, specially for X-networks due to the distributed nature of their transmitter and receiver sides. An important future direction of this work is to develop new upper bounds on the DoF of K-user X-networks studied here.

References

[1] S. A. Jafar, *Interference alignment: A new look at signal dimensions in a communication network*. Now Publishers Inc, 2011.

[2] V. Cadambe and S. Jafar, "Interference alignment and the degrees of freedom of wireless X networks," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, no. 9, pp. 3893–3908, 2009.

[3] M. Maddah-Ali, A. Motahari, and A. Khandani, "Signaling over mimo multi-base systems: Combination of multi-access and broadcast schemes," in *Information Theory, 2006 IEEE International Symposium on*, July 2006, pp. 2104–2108.

[4] S. Jafar and S. Shamai, "Degrees of freedom region of the MIMO X channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 151–170, 2008.

[5] C. Shannon, "The zero error capacity of a noisy channel," *Information Theory, IRE Transactions on*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 8–19, September 1956.

[6] C. Huang, S. A. Jafar, S. Shamai, and S. Vishwanath, "On degrees of freedom region of MIMO networks without channel state information at transmitters," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 849–857, 2012.

[7] C. Vaze and M. Varanasi, "The degree-of-freedom regions of MIMO broadcast, interference, and cognitive radio channels with no CSIT," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 8, pp. 5354–5374, 2012.

[8] S. A. Jafar, "Blind interference alignment," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 216–227, 2012.

[9] N. Jindal, "Mimo broadcast channels with finite-rate feedback," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 52, no. 11, pp. 5045–5060, Nov 2006.

[10] M. Kobayashi, G. Caire, and N. Jindal, "How much training and feedback are needed in mimo broadcast channels?" in *Information Theory, 2008. ISIT 2008. IEEE International Symposium on*, July 2008, pp. 2663–2667.

[11] H. Weingarten, S. Shamai, and G. Kramer, "On the compound MIMO broadcast channel," in *Proceedings of Annual Information Theory and Applications Workshop UCSD*, 2007.

[12] T. Gou, S. A. Jafar, and C. Wang, "On the degrees of freedom of finite state compound wireless networks," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 6, pp. 3286–3308, 2011.

[13] M. A. Maddah-Ali, "On the degrees of freedom of the compound MISO broadcast channels with finite states," in *proceedings IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT) 2010.*

[14] M. A. Maddah-Ali and D. Tse, "Completely stale transmitter channel state information is still very useful," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 4418–4431, 2012.

[15] H. Maleki, S. A. Jafar, and S. Shamai, "Retrospective interference alignment over interference networks," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 228–240, 2012.

[16] A. Ghasemi, A. S. Motahari, and A. K. Khandani, "On the degrees of freedom of X channel with delayed CSIT," in *proceedings IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT) 2011.*

[17] M. A. Maddah-Ali, A. S. Motahari, and A. K. Khandani, "Communication over MIMO X channels: Interference alignment, decomposition, and performance analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 3457–3470, 2008.

[18] A. Wagdy, A. El-Keyi, T. Khattab, and M. Nafie, "A degrees of freedom-optimal scheme for SISO X channel with synergistic alternating CSIT," in *proceedings IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT) 2014.*

[19]

[20] S. Lashgari, A. Avestimehr, and C. Suh, "Linear degrees of freedom of the X -channel with delayed CSIT," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 2180–2189, April 2014.

[21] R. Tandon, S. Mohajer, H. Poor, and S. Shamai, "On x-channels with feedback and delayed csi," in *Information Theory Proceedings (ISIT), 2012 IEEE International Symposium on*, July 2012, pp. 1877–1881.

[22] Y. Tian and A. Yener, "Guiding blind transmitters: Degrees of freedom optimal interference alignment using relays," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 59, no. 8, pp. 4819–4832, Aug 2013.